MOUNT UNION COLLEGE
LIBRARY
Stack
Book No. 232.1-C773c
Accession No. 17592
Purchased
Gift of W.H+H.M. Rider.

OTHER WORKS BY
THE SAME AUTHOR

The Historic Episcopate. A Study of Anglican Claims and Methodist Orders. 12mo. $1.00.

Judicial Decisions of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With introduction by James M. Buckley, LL.D. 12mo. With notes. $1.00.

Outlines of the Doctrine of the Resurrection. Biblical, Historical, and Scientific. Introduction by D. D. Whedon. 12mo. 90c.

Reasons for Church Creed. A Contribution to Present-Day Controversies. 12mo. 45c.

History of the Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with a Commentary on its Offices. 12mo. $1.20.

Christianity and Childhood; or, the Relation of Children to the Church. 12mo. 50c, net.

Christ and the Critics, Gerome. 16mo. 50c. net.

THE INCARNATION

AND

RECENT CRITICISM

FROM
W. H. & HAROLD M. RIDER
TO
MT. UNION COLLEGE

BY

R. J. COOKE, D.D.

Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος . .
Καί ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο



NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & GRAHAM

232.1
C773i

17592
Copyright, 1907, by
EATON & MAINS.

TO THE BLESSED MEMORY OF HER
WHO NOW RESTS IN THE BOSOM OF
GOD BUT WHOSE PRESENCE IN OUR HOME
FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS WIFE
AND MOTHER WAS MY INSPIRATION
AND JOY, I DEDICATE THESE PAGES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

DEDICATION v

PREFACE ix

CHAPTER I

OLD FOES WITH NEW FACES 1

CHAPTER II

WHO WAS JESUS? 31

CHAPTER III

THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND HEBREW SOURCES 69

CHAPTER IV

THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND HEATHEN PARALLELS 89

CHAPTER V

DID PAUL KNOW OF THE VIRGIN BIRTH? 114

CHAPTER VI

THE SINLESS CHRIST 140

CHAPTER VII

WENDT'S THEORY OF ETHICAL UNION 154

CHAPTER VIII

BEYSCHLAG'S THEORY OF A GOD-FILLED MAN 167

CHAPTER IX

JESUS, THE MASTER-TEACHER 182

CHAPTER X

THE KENOSIS 201

CHAPTER XI

THE LESSON FOR THE MODERN LIFE 230

PREFACE

The purpose of the following pages is to review the methods and findings of negative criticism on the Incarnation, the gospel narratives of the virgin birth, the essential Deity of Jesus of Nazareth, and to show the untrustworthy character of rationalistic thought on these and related themes. Since the really great works of Neander, Van Oosterzee, Pressensé, Liddon, Uhlhorn, Edersheim, J. P. Lange, C. A. Row, and many shelves of others appeared in answer to Strauss, Renan, Schenkel and their disciples, there has arisen a new school of so-called Liberal thought represented in the main by such critics as Lobstein, Réville, Harnack, Pfleiderer, and other well known writers. The works of these European scholars translated into English and published in cheap form have popularized to a large extent the critical studies of specialists in Christological subjects and presented in such confident manner the objections of skeptics to the dogmatic contents of Christian belief in the Person of the world's Redeemer that, if shadow were taken for substance, assertion for proof, one would suppose the enemy had at last carried by assault the citadel of the Christian faith. But, while the works of these writers have been largely circulated in this country, no work dealing specifically from the standpoint of faith with these recent theories has yet appeared in popular form. Hence this attempt, limited and imperfect as it is, to supply the need. A study of these pages, how-

ever, will show that no point of real importance in the contentions of these writers has been omitted or uncandidly dealt with. From these observations it will be seen that I have not attempted a formal work on the doctrine of the Incarnation itself as a theological dogma, but a review of recent criticism of the several subjects related to or included under that subject. It will also be seen that in the discussion of the facts relating to the Person of our Lord from the Christian point of view that which is obvious to every intelligent interpreter of the faith has been purposely discarded, and those questions only are considered which are deemed the most difficult and on which the average thinker needs the most help.

Originally prepared, with the exception of one or two chapters which appeared in the *Methodist Review,* for oral delivery as lectures before representative bodies of ministers, and without any thought of future publication, it would be more agreeable doubtless to severe literary taste had the whole been recast and presented in a more didactic form; but such a change would hardly have added any compensating value to the volume and would not perhaps be entirely to the satisfaction of those who heard the lectures, and in response to whose requests and resolutions they are published.

May He concerning whom these pages were written bless them to the strengthening of faith among the Doubtful and to the joy and comfort of those who believe.

R. J. C.

CHAPTER I

Old Foes with New Faces

The announcement of such a subject as the Incarnation for a popular lecture may occasion some misgivings, but, setting aside for the present the many questions which may arise, it will be conceded, I think, on a general survey of the religious situation and the tendency of theological thought, that, whatever may be the difficulties in the way of doing the subject full justice, there is need at this time for a clear, definite and distinct reaffirmation of the central doctrine of Christianity: the Incarnation of the very God in the person of Jesus Christ.

This is a building era. The processes of destruction and construction of articles of belief are going on side by side. Scarcely a doctrine of the Christian faith could be stated in the light of modern research, or, if stated, wrought out, in the manner and within the limitations of a few decades ago. The popularizing of research in the domains of archæology, comparative religion, philosophy, and biblical criticism has not been without effect upon religious thought. All classes of men have felt the influence of recent theological discussions on the authorship of the Bible, Messianic prophecy, miracles, the person and work of the Redeemer, the growth of dogma, and the origin and development of Christian institutions. The universal cry, "Back to Christ!"—as if there were

any other Christ than the Christ delineated by the gospels or that we should know him to be the Christ if he were discovered—voiced the widespread influence theological discussions have had upon the popular mind.

But, while this is a critical and constructive period, it is not a strikingly spiritual period. Dogma is not a characteristic note of the contemporary pulpit. The universal revivals which Christian optimists have prophesied have not arrived. A species of agnosticism, perhaps indifferentism, contends for the place in the Christian consciousness once held by positive belief, and Christian experience, that last stronghold of faith, is viewed with suspicion, if stoutly affirmed, as the doubtful product of an optimistic turn of mind, or as a fit theme for the clinic of a psychologist.[1] It is not that the cardinal facts of religion are denied; they would be vigorously contended for if they were denied; but that they have in some felt degree receded into the background of Christian life as motive powers, as positive convictions, as indubitable, infallible truths of God. But dogma is pushed aside for a vague undenominational religion as being unessential, nonunderstandable, debatable as to content, and therefore tending to division rather than to solidarity; and ethical Christianity, the Christianity of philanthropy and altruism, comes to the throne in the practical thought of a commercial age.

And yet, while the fundamental truths of Christianity are not categorically denied, they are neither

[1] James, *Varieties of Religious Experience.*

persistently written about nor vigorously preached. Other subjects, which are supposed to be more practical, more consonant with the thought and spirit of modern life, are forced upon the people. The New shoulders out the Old. The blessed evangel that God is Love is so exclusively emphasized that the idea of God as the Holy One who abhors iniquity and will punish the transgressor has become, in current theological literature and in the minds of many, a vanishing remnant of mediæval theology. The incomparable sacrifice on Calvary becomes in some quarters a martyrdom to a moral ideal. Christ the Redeemer becomes Christ the Exemplar. The consciousness of sin is no longer so keen that a blood-atonement for the sin of the race is a necessity in the thoughts of men—who often, amid the discordant cries of theological criticism, the revamping of old heresies, the materialism and aggressive coarseness of modern life, know not what to believe and end in believing nothing that makes any serious draft on wavering faith or indolent intellect.

Christ is our pattern. He is the way, and the only way, to the Father. But he is more than that. He is more to us than Mohammed is to the Mohammedans, than Buddha is to Buddhists. If not more, then less. If he is not the divine Redeemer we are yet in our sins. Before he can become our pattern he must become our Redeemer. He must become to us the Son of God, the only Saviour of men. No modification of that tremendous truth can ever take the place of the original. Sentimental poetizing on ethics in which there is no atoning Christ may be very satis-

factory to a *blasé* culture which would "die of a rose, in aromatic pain," and is no true culture at all, but it never strengthened a martyr at the stake, gave inspiration or motive to humanity battling for freedom, helped the struggling toiler to bear with patience and courage the burdens and sorrows of a toilsome life, or gave hope of pardon to a sinful man seeking reconciliation with his God. Never can the Church of Christ thrive on theories and dreams, music and art, literary entertainments and social clubs. The Cross, the Cross alone, is the inspiration of the Church; the Cross alone is the hope of the world, the magnet which alone can draw men from moral darkness and carnality to purity and light. Set that aside and the Church becomes a nerveless declaimer of useless inanities, mumbling to itself make-believes, theologic and philanthropic, of its own devising, and depending more for its numerical success on operatic programs and other performances than on the life-giving power of the Spirit of God. It is a sad day for any church when it is compelled to make up in the choir for what it lacks in the pulpit; and it is a dark day for any minister when for the solid axiomatic truths of Christianity—if he ever fully grasped them and understood them in their relations to human needs and human history—he substitutes the philological or literary excursions of those who never brought a human soul to Christ or knew the difference between the joys of religious experience and the self-complacency arising from a contemplation of their own theories. If, then, this diagnosis of one phase of the religious situation is even approximately correct, what better could one

do than to bring afresh to your attention the cardinal fact of Christianity? Nothing stands out more clearly in all the mountain range of the centuries than that periods of spiritual declension have always been marked by low views or obscuration of the person and work of Christ.

But, whether this view of the religious situation is correct or not, the doctrine of the Incarnation is at this time the problem of problems in the higher circles of theological discussion. What is discussed or thought out here, whether true or false, cannot be a matter of indifference. From here radiate those thought waves which influence the thinking of the pastors of Christendom, even to the remotest missionary on the "far flung line" of our Christian frontiers, and through these pastors, in large measure, these teachings deaden or inspire the thought and spiritual tone of the churches.[1] Today, as in all days, the person of Christ is to some the sphinx of history. Now, as ever, he remains the inscrutable, adorable mystery. Every age endeavors to take his measure, to bring him within the limits of its comprehension, but he ever transcends the highest reaches of our intellect and our keenest analysis fully to apprehend him or to translate the idea of his being into clear thought. For this reason, now as heretofore, the doctrine of the Incarnation—the union of the divine and the

[1] This is true even in the Roman Church. In his letters to his friend Berthelot, Renan writes: "It was in the heart of the Apennines, far from all beaten tracks, that I was to find again the modern spirit, France, whose image I had not beheld for so long. The first book that I met with in the cell of Father Sebastiano, the librarian, was Strauss's Life of Jesus!"—*Letters from the Holy Land*, p. 79.

human in one person—is rejected by many as unthinkable, or, if thinkable, unnecessary, or attempts are made to so interpret it or explain it that it will no longer be the insoluble problem of the Christian faith. Difficulties, metaphysical, historical, exegetical, and other, are so easily discovered and so skillfully arrayed against intellectual acceptance of the doctrine that, if not divine and of the very heart of the Christian revelation, it becomes an interesting phenomenon in the history of religion that such a belief could ever have been adopted by the Christian Church, or if adopted, retained, and should be still maintained as the foundation stone of the Christian faith, in spite of all the accumulations of reasons against it, in spite of the many organized oppositions against it in the run of the ages, and in spite of the fact that it would have been infinitely easier to have adopted a simpler doctrine of the nature of Christ—often suggested and as often rejected—than this mysterious dogma which baffles the keenest intellects that ever wrestled with philosophical problems.

In addition to metaphysical, historical, and other objections which are not at all new to students of the theology of the early Church and the conflicts with the various attempts to construct a Christology which would be on a level with human reason—Arianism, Monophytism, Eutychianism, the doctrines of Apollinaris and Nestorius, and many other failures—modern believers in a non-miraculous Christianity, which is nothing more than a mere product of their own dreaming, exert all their skill and learning against the doctrine from critical and

exegetical grounds. It is insisted by these rationalists that the Incarnation, as set forth in the gospels of Matthew and Luke, is not only a miracle but an unnecessary miracle; that the accounts of Matthew and Luke are later additions to the original record; that these gospels not only originally conceded that the people among whom Jesus lived, and his family also, knew him as the son of Joseph and Mary, but that the genealogies[1] which they give, tracing his pedigree back to David through his sonship to Joseph, could only have been devised by their original authors in the belief that he was actually Joseph's son; that the two accounts by Matthew and Luke not only conflict in matters of detail, as in the genealogies, but that it is impossible to reconcile their discrepancies or to accept as veritable history their confusing statements; and that the virgin birth stories of Matthew and Luke cancel each other's historicity. Luke, it is affirmed, seems to know nothing of the principal events recorded by Matthew. In Matthew the angel of the annunciation appears to Joseph, in Luke to Mary. If Mary had a vision of an angel announcing the birth of the Messiah would she keep this secret from Joseph? And how shall the fact be accounted for that Joseph "was minded to put her away" if he knew of the heavenly secret? Who does not see, exclaims Keim,[2] that Matthew neither knows nor admits the annunciation of Luke? He knows them not; for he does not hint one word at any revelation to Mary

[1] For an exhaustive study of the genealogies see Ebrard, *Gospel History*, T. & T. Clark, p. 19, and B. Weiss, *Life of Christ*, vol. i. p. 217.

[2] *Jesus of Nazareth*, vol. i.

preceding the appearance of the angel to Joseph as though it had been the subject of his incredulous doubt. The massacre of the innocents at Bethlehem is unhistorical, Josephus knows nothing of such an extraordinary event.

By such criticism of the narratives of the nativity in Matthew and Luke, with a view to proving their inconsistencies, various kinds of difficulties, inconceivabilities and contradictions are discovered or invented in the fragmentary notices of the birthplace; the time of the birth; the taxing under Quirinius; the visit of the Magi; Simeon and Anna in the Temple spreading the news of the Child's birth in Jerusalem; the excitements in Herod's court; and the sudden call of the Sanhedrin on the visit of the Magi inquiring for the Child. The unhistorical character of these narratives—all of which are embellished in the apocryphal gospels—is clearly discernible, it is affirmed; for if angel hosts sang at Bethlehem, and shepherds heard their glad announcement, and obeying their instructions, found the Babe lying in the manger—a difficult undertaking in a crowded village to find anyone—all Jerusalem, which was not far distant, as well as all in Bethlehem must have heard the stupendous news, and therefore Simeon and Anna's declaration in the Temple was as unnecessary as it was impossible for Herod, or the hastily summoned Sanhedrin, or "all Jerusalem," to have been so astounded and perplexed as is stated on the arrival of the Magi.

As a result of this extremely critical treatment of the gospel narratives the virgin birth is reduced to pious legend. It is declared to be a result of the

idealizing tendencies in the early Church concerning the person of Jesus, which poetizings, according to some critics, were induced by Old Testament incidents, and by others are regarded as the outcome of influences of Hellenic and ancient Babylonian mythology in which may be found parallels to every notable deed and event in the life of Christ.

Then there are objections of another character. The eminent professor, Dr. Charles A. Briggs, preaches that the virgin birth "is only a minor matter connected with the Incarnation," and that "that which is unknown to the teachings of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, Saint John and Saint James, and our Lord himself, and is absent from the earliest and latest gospels, cannot be so essential as many people have supposed."[1]

Professor Hans Wendt asserts[2] the ethical divinity of Christ but denies his essential deity. The author of the English work, *The Spirit and the Incarnation,* Dr. Walker, teaches a gradual incarnation. Dr. Dorner, who once stoutly affirmed a trinity of personal distinctions, contends in his later work[3] for a trinity of modes or impersonal momenta, which admits of the incarnation of a divine principle in Christ, but not of the incarnation of a divine personality.

These are some of the many theories and notions which appeal to the thought of our time.

To some people it probably signifies little what these theories are or what their influence may be. But such

[1] *The Incarnation of the Lord,* p. 217.
[2] *Teaching of Jesus,* Eng. trans.
[3] *System of Christian Doctrine,* vol. i. 382, Eng. trans.

questions are of much significance when related to the power and efficiency of the Christian ministry with its message to a world which today, with its wealth and poverty, its faith and unfaith, its fierce struggles and fathomless longings, is almost a reproduction of the Roman days when, like a fresh breath of the morning on a fevered brow, Christ came as the Saviour, the Healer of men, and gave a new lease to humanity, laying his hand upon the weak spots in human life, saying, "Thou ailest here—and here!" It was of supreme importance what answer the disciples returned to the question—"Who say ye that I am?" They were to preach Christ. They were to stand in the market place and amid the multitudinous criers of world-panaceas hold up to men the true medicine for a sin-sick world. In the presence of kings and the crouching lowly, in the quiet halls of philosophy and at the altars of the gods of a thousand years they were to tell of the Christ they knew.

Today, here is the Anarchist, at once the product and the terror of social and political progress; there stands the criminal, the Ishmaelite of civilization; yonder stands a group of disciplined minds trained in science and testing all truth in the searchlight of experiment; here are the struggling, toiling masses, "their emotional and intellectual souls awake at last and demanding new satisfactions which social and economic conditions cannot give"[1]; yonder is the refined paganism of modern society, atheistic in the head, superstitious in the heart, mere triflers, with nerves more sensitive than their hearts, as the records

[1] Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question.*

of the divorce courts demonstrate, and "seeking to season the platitude of existence with a more or less voluptuous æstheticism."

The world's ache at bottom is a heart-ache. What kind of a Christ, then, shall we present for the healing of the people? What Christ is equal to the situation? Is it the Christ of Strauss, of Renan, of Theodore Parker, or the Christ of the gospels? An invented Christ, or the Christ of history? We cannot evade the challenge of Jesus, "Who say ye that I am?" What we are, within and without, what the salvation of society shall be, depends upon the answer we give. We may, with Ritschl, evade such questions, or talk much in an evasive manner of Christ having for us the "value of God," but an undefined Christ is no Christ at all to the man of science, and a Christ that is not God has no saving power on the millions of humanity, for they also are men. Like a beautiful dream when one awakes, the merely human Christ fades away amid the grime and heat, the struggles for bread, the infinite wickedness, the sorrows and disappointments of a disillusioned life.

Low views of Christ may be held in order that small men may look tall. But low views of Christ give no inspiration to spiritual quickenings; from them comes to the jaded millions no transfiguring power. By an inevitable law all theories of Christ which make him less than God lead at last to a denial of all truth. We see this in the downward slope of Unitarianism from the high Arian standpoint of Channing to the position it holds today among its chief exponents. Twenty years ago the late Dr. Martineau wrote that in Eng-

lish Unitarianism Messianic theology had become mythology. "From the person of Jesus, for instance," he says, "from the person of Jesus everything attached to him by evangelists or divines has fallen away; when they put such false robes on him they were but leading him to death. The pomp of royal lineage and fulfilled prediction, the prerogative of King, of Priest, of Judge, the advent with retinue of angels on the clouds of heaven, are to us men deforming investitures, misplaced, like court dresses on the 'spirits of the just,' and he is simply the Divine Flower of Humanity blossoming after ages of spiritual growth—the realized possibility of life in God. . . . All that has been added to that real historic scene—the angels that hang around His birth and the fiend that tempts his youth; the dignities that await his future—the throne, the trumpet, the assize, the bar of Judgment; with all the apocalyptic splendors that ensue—Hades and the Crystal sea, Paradise and the Infernal Gulf, nay, the very boundary walls of the Cosmic panorama that contains these things, have for us melted away, and left us amid the infinite spaces and the silent stars."[1]

The Ritschlian Harnack, in his recent work, *What Is Christianity?,* seems to have reached a similar conclusion. In these lectures, which he delivered in Berlin in 1899-1900 to more than six hundred students, and which created more stir in theological Germany than any work published there since Schleiermacher's famous *Discourses,* there is much sound truth, much on several subjects that needed to be

[1] *Loss and Gain.*

said, but his whole attitude toward Christocentric Christianity—the Christianity of the New Testament—is one of subtle hostility. Not one of his affirmations concerning Christ and the apostolic doctrine of the person and the mission of the Redeemer would lift him above the Martineau type of Unitarianism. To Harnack, Jesus is not God manifested in the flesh. He is only a Jewish rabbi, closer to God than others, even the most exalted among the sons of men by reason of a unique consciousness of filial relation to God, but still a human teacher only. We see him there amid the grass and the lilies, surrounded by his disciples, by peasants and crude fishermen. It is a lovely picture, idyllic, and every way delightful to one at all responsive to the spiritual and artistic. Jesus is preaching in a Semitic dialect to these wondering, simple-minded people in an uncommon way. Beyond, on the far horizon, snowy mountain peaks; there, the town of Safed; near by, the blue sea of Galilee; yonder, corn-fields, vineyards, olive-gardens, sheepfolds, and little villages fill in the scene. He is from Nazareth,[1] this religious genius, more recently from Capernaum. His father is a carpenter, and he too has toiled for the support of the family till the impulse came upon him to take up the work of a prophet and a teacher. But he is only a religious genius. There was no incarnation, no virgin birth, no miracle of any kind, though many wonders happened; no bodily resurrection. All these are additions to the Matchless Life. Jesus simply preached the gospel, and the whole

[1] So also Oscar Holtzman, *Life of Jesus*, who insists that Jesus was born at Nazareth and not at Bethlehem.

of his teaching may be summed up in one sentence, "God as the Father, and the human soul so ennobled that it can and does commune with him." "The gospel," says Harnack, as Jesus proclaimed it, "has to do with the Father only, not with the Son"—which statement deprives Jesus, as the Sent of God for the world's redemption, of the central place in the gospel. Jesus was not divine. "The sentence, 'I am the Son of God,' was not inserted," he says, "in the gospel by Jesus himself, and to put that sentence there side by side with the others is to make an addition to the gospel." "Paul became the author of the speculative idea that not only was God in Christ, but that Christ himself was possessed of a peculiar nature of a heavenly kind."

More than once in these lectures does Harnack object to the identification of Jesus, "a person who appeared in time and space relations," with the eternal Logos. He even goes farther and denies the real existence of any Logos. "The identification of the Logos with Christ was the determining factor in the fusion of Greek philosophy with the apostolic inheritance, and led the more thoughtful Greeks to adopt the latter. Most of us regard this identification as inadmissible, because the way we conceive the world and ethics does not point to the existence of any Logos at all." In a word, the Christ of the gospels and of the Church is something other than the Jesus who sat among the lilies on the hill-sides of Galilee, the Jewish rabbi who preached in simple phrase the kingdom of God to the ignorant fishermen and wondering peasants about him. The historic Christ of Harnack was a

purely human being who has been misrepresented and misinterpreted by those who would do him honor.

Martineau and Harnack are not alone in their views of the person and mission of Christ. Unitarian negations more or less modified or disguised by orthodox phrasing are presented now and then by supposed teachers of the evangelical creed who would resent the imputation of being Unitarians, but who manifest much artistic skill in the accommodation of the language of Canaan to the faith of the Philistines. They forget that to spiritualize is often to vaporize. But what must be the result of such belief, if belief it may be called, upon those churches which endure such teaching? What permanent influence has Unitarianism had upon the religious life of England or America? In England it has dwindled in religious influence to zero, and in the United States it has long since become a comparatively spent force. A hundred years ago in New England, where Unitarianism had its home, churches which preached a divine Christ, and they were few in number, had limited recognition and seemingly a doubtful future. Unitarianism swept the field. "Of the twenty-five churches first founded in Massachusetts," says Dr. Leonard Woolsey Bacon,[1] "about twenty were Unitarian. The wealth, culture, and social influence of Boston were Unitarian. The great offices of the state were held by Unitarians. . . . The Unitarian clergy list was such a roster of splendid names as no clergy of like numbers in Christendom could show; . . . there was much to justify the prophecy that was uttered that

[1] *The Story of the Churches:* The Congregationalists.

Unitarianism would presently become the prevailing form of American Christianity."

But at the present time, out of 31,413,269 Christians of all denominations in the United States, the Unitarians number only 71,000.

Why has Unitarianism in England, with such renowned names giving it prestige as Sir Isaac Newton, Locke, and Priestley; in Geneva, with such a leader as Edmond Scherer favorable to its views; in France, with such representatives of the critical school as Colani, Reuss, Réville, Pecaut, and Coquerel one with it in its views of Christ—why is it that Unitarianism has so utterly failed to exert a saving influence on every section of society in Europe? And why is it that in the United States the prophecy of its ultimate spread has not only not been fulfilled, but Unitarianism itself has become a mere negative influence, and no longer a force, in the religious progress of the nation? The answer is not difficult to find. No negative form of belief can ever have a positive influence on the conscience. Men are not saved by negations, but by convictions. No form of Christianity which denies the essential deity of Christ can ever present a Christ to the millions who can have in himself sufficient authority to command the assent of the intellect, or the saving power to create a consciousness of the indwelling of God in the souls of men; which experience is the sole proof and the only compelling self-evidencing proof of personal harmony with God. Without that conviction no one is ever sure of God.

It is not my purpose to discuss all these theories and notions—for there is nothing new or very interesting

in many of these old foes with new faces—but only some of the more prominent teachings of well-known writers whose works, translated and in the original, are exercising widespread influence on the thought of many.

There is little need, for example, to discuss at length the possibility of an incarnation. To assume, as some do, that the Infinite and Eternal is not concerned with this mote of a world in the illimitable universe is contrary to sound reason,[1] since the creation of this world was evidently worth while, otherwise it would not have been at all. Lack of interest in humanity on the part of the Infinite and Eternal would make him of no value to humanity, and certainly less in moral character than the gods of Olympus or any good man who helps his fellows.[2]

Moreover, sound reason demands that this divine interest in humanity, manifested gradually through successive ages, voicing itself in various ways in all lands and especially in Israel through seer and prophet, and the development of world-history, should progress more and more till it reached its completion in the fullest manifestation of the divine. Nothing short of this will satisfy the logical reason. Without it history is incomplete, a statue without a head. The Scriptures declare that this manifestation was made

[1] See Alfred Russel Wallace's *Man's Place in the Universe*, p. 313.

[2] "Do I find love so full in my nature, God's ultimate gift,
That I doubt his own love can compete with it? here the parts shift?
Here the creature surpass the Creator? The end what Began?"
—Browning's *Saul.*

"The loving worm within its clod
Were diviner than a loveless God
Amid his worlds."
—Browning's *Christmas Eve.*

in Jesus Christ, in *the fullness of time*. In this manifestation we see the purpose of evolution, the reason for the historic development of the race, and nowhere else. Each succeeding age of the past was a prophecy, and every great historic event prepared the way for the fulfillment of that prophecy, in the coming of the expected One, *the Desire of all nations*. In him all the past has its meaning. In him all the past has its end, and all the future its beginning. He is the explanation of history, and thus the Incarnation of God fits in with the whole scheme of the ages and the demands of the highest reason.

Nor is it necessary to enter into every little detail of apparent discrepancy which rationalistic criticism urges against the gospel account of the virgin birth, for to every man of practical sense the unimportant and sometimes frivolous character of the objections raised will be sufficient.[3] Some of these, however, will be noticed in the progress of the argument.

But it may be observed here that to assume, for example, that there was no slaughter of innocents at Bethlehem solely on the ground that no mention is made by Josephus of such a massacre comes very near trifling with the subject. The argument from silence cannot go that far. What we know of the character of Herod in his later days more than offsets the silence of Josephus. The tendency to regard the statement of Luke concerning the census as an invention, in order to make it appear that Christ was born in Bethlehem according to prophecy when as a matter of fact he was born in Nazareth, as Oscar Holtzman con-

[3] See *Life of Christ*, Bernhard Weiss, vol. i, pp. 228, 229.

tends, is another example. The really important and practical question is not whether Luke blundered in his dates or in his names, *but whether there was a decree for a census at all or not.* If there was a census —that is, a decree for one, whether the census was taken then or later matters not—then the journey of Joseph and Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem has a real historical reason, *Joseph being of the house and lineage of David.* But if there was no census, no decree made for one at all, then the narrative of the journey to Bethlehem is simply unhistorical, and we must revise our entire content of belief.

But was there no census, no decree? Is it conceivable that a writer like Luke should have deliberately stated, as an historic fact known to everyone, the taking of a census by imperial decree when he must have known that no such decree had been made; that no census had been taken at any time, and that his invention, which was wholly unnecessary, could be fully exposed and his whole gospel rendered worthless? No one can believe such a desperate statement as that. Luke is a careful writer, an accurate, painstaking historian, as the archæological researches of Professor Ramsay of Aberdeen have fully demonstrated, and no man in touch with life's practical affairs can bring himself to believe that Luke would have made statements which could have been easily refuted if they were not known to be true.

That historical difficulties, some real, some imaginary, are found in Luke's text may be admitted, but they have been emphasized far beyond their importance. We know that at the time of our Lord's birth

Quintilius Varus was governor of Syria, and not Caius Sulpicius Quirinius (Cyrenius), who did not become governor till about A. D. 11. But Luke does not state, as his critics make him say, that Quirinius was governor when Christ was born. Nor if the evangelist is correctly interpreted does he affirm that the actual taxing occurred at that time but that an imperial decree (*δόγμα*) was made at that time for a general enrollment (*ἀπογραφή*) and that the taxing itself (*ἀυτήν*) *this taxing,* which was not enforced by reason of internal troubles—the death of Herod and the ambition of Archelaus—was "first made" when Quirinius was governor of Syria.

If Acts 5. 37 is compared with Josephus, Antiq. xvii, c. 5. Sec. 2, and his book on the Jewish Wars xx, it will be seen that Luke had full knowledge of the several taxings and of the events of that period. But for a complete study of the whole subject in addition to the classical work of Zumpt and the *Observations* of Winer, the reader should consult the notes on the text by Canon Cook in *The Speaker's Commentary* and especially Professor Ramsay's exhaustive little work, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?*

So far as Harnack is concerned, it is historically certain that the Christ he presents in these Berlin lectures never existed. The only portraiture of Jesus we have is that contained in the four gospels. We cannot pick out bits here and there from these historic records and build another Christ according to our fancies. We cannot take the marvelous portraitures of that incomparable Life and paint other features there and pass them off on mankind as the original of

him who, as Jean Paul Richter says, was the Highest among the holy and the Holiest among the high, who with his pierced hands lifted empires off their hinges, turned the stream of history from its channel and still governs the ages.

But this is just what Harnack tries to do. Of course it is easy, because of preconceived notions of history and philosophy, but at the same time it is the most arbitrary thing in the world to set aside every historical statement of the evangelists as an idealization of a religious teacher who, in obedience to a secret impulse, essayed the role of a Messiah—easy to strip him of every vestige of divinity, of every superlatively distinguishing character, of every radiant form of love and moral beauty which exalts him above the heavens and above every name that is named in heaven and in earth, and having thus reduced him to the common level of poor humanity—clothed with a purple robe and a crown of platted thorns on his brow—to present him as the real Jesus of history, and cry with the mob, "Hail, King of the Jews!" There is nothing easier than that, but at the same time there is nothing more unhistorical or more unworthy of the enlightened scholarship and the culture of the twentieth century.

As a matter of fact, there is no correspondence between the Christ Harnack draws, a Christ denuded of all supernatural qualities and powers, a mere product of Harnack's neo-Kantian philosophy, and the Jesus delineated in the gospels. The gospels may be untrustworthy, as rationalists try to think, but, whether true or false, they are all the history we have, and in

the whole of history there is nothing more certain than that the Christ of the gospels is not the Christ of the Berlin lectures.

As Johannes Lepsius says, concerning this archæological romance-figure,[1] this "Jesus" of Harnack has a history. "His genealogy goes back to the eighteenth century; English deists, French encyclopedists, German rationalists are numbered among his forefathers. On his father's side he is descended from David Strauss; on his mother's side from Ernest Renan." But with this "Jesus" of modern theological romance, the theology of Julicher, Holtzman, Wernle, V. Soden, Harnack, Otto Meyer, and others, the Jesus of the New Testament has nothing more in common than the name. The apostles would never have recognized him; Augustine would never have been converted to him; Luther would never have confessed him before the Kaiser and the empire. In the Christianity of two thousand years he is unknown. A Christian church would never have been founded by him. In the kingdom of Christian art one looks in vain for his portrait. From Giotto and Herbert Van Eyck to Eduard Von Gebhardt and Fritz Von Uyhde the only Jesus that is painted is the Jesus of the gospels. Handel would never have filled the world with his jubilees over this hero of modern theology, nor would Bach have ever stirred the heart with his plaintive notes over the sorrows of this mythical hero.

It would argue little knowledge of the history of unbelief to entertain the fear that these reconstructors of history or any philosophizing romancers hereafter

[1] *Das Reich Christi,* Jan. No. 1.

like them can for any length of time obscure the person of Jesus as he looks at us from out the four gospels. The older rationalists failed in that effort and modern iconoclasts have neither the originality nor the intellectual vigor of those earlier critics who seemed to have at least some conviction in their enthusiasm. Strauss is gone, and few today even know of his once famous work *Leben Jesu*. Others have followed in his wake. On the sixth of October, 1845, Renan shut the iron gate of the seminary of Saint Sulpice behind him and crossing the square—where the sculptured fountains were playing and laughing children were running in and out among the shaded benches on which old women of the neighborhood sat knitting and gossiping—he entered the home of a friend and exchanged his clerical garb for lay attire. That was his leave-taking of the Roman Church and the faith of his childhood. Eighteen years later his *Life of Jesus* appeared; a work which was one of the most determined efforts ever made to rob the Christ of his divine character and to reduce him to the level of a religious enthusiast who was not above stooping to the methods of trickery for the realization of his dreams. Well, the sculptured fountains are still playing in the square of Saint Sulpice, the bell in the tall tower on the corner still calls to prayer, little children still play among the benches and run in there in the same old church with its faded pictures to recite their catechism, which, whatever else it may teach, still tells them that Jesus is the Son of God. And Renan—? While in the circles of some students he may yet be remembered as the most distinguished man of letters

in France of the nineteenth century, nevertheless his *Life of Jesus* has long since been thrown aside by thoughtful men wherever it was once read. So all these once great names pass away. Jesus stays.

Nor did the early Christianity which Harnack describes ever exist. There never was a non-miraculous Christianity. Christianity is founded on miracle, above all, the miracle of a person. The desperate attempt to make possible an Easter faith without an Easter message—the fact that Christ rose from the dead and appeared to his disciples—has no more claim on rational thought than the irrational statement that a shadow can exist without light. We may throw miracle into the scrap pile of anachronisms and incredibilities, but unfaith and this easy-going method of getting rid of the unwelcome will never change the historical fact that, whether true or false, the only Christianity history knows anything about is a Christianity in which the miraculous is an essential element.

It is said of Professor Harnack that in these lectures he "offers to the present age a Christianity which is elastic enough to take up into itself the new ideas won for modern culture by the labors of Lessing and Kant, of Goethe and Schiller, of Hegel and Schleiermacher, and by the exact sciences of the nineteenth century, without thereby losing any of its religious warmth and moral strictness." But Professor Harnack does this simply by surrendering everything that is Christian. The Christianity which he offers as a substitute for the Christianity of the apostles of our Lord, the faith and experience of a John, a Peter, and a Paul, is nothing more than ethical Judaism; a

Judaism stripped of its supernatural character and history and reduced to a code of morals. It is not Christianity, but a corpse substituted for a living body. Dr. Martineau, the English Unitarian, long ago anticipated Professor Harnack in this new invention which has awakened such interest in Germany, as he did the spiritually-minded but illogical Sabatier, of the Protestant faculty in Paris, who saws off the limb he sits on by manufacturing a supposed Christ from a discredited gospel. Like Harnack, Sabatier throws overboard all Christian institutions as without divine authority, and exalts what he terms the religion of the spirit as the essence of Christianity. Sabatier forgets, or chooses to ignore, as does Harnack, the historical fact that there never was known to Christianity a religion of the spirit divorced from a person—the divine Jesus. Religion is not Ritual but it certainly is not Opinion.

One of the subtlest foes of evangelical faith, an enemy which affords the greatest aid to Romanism and the unhistorical claims of the High Church party in the Church of England, and which at the same time silently undermines all rational reasons or accepted scriptural grounds for the necessary existence of any church or of any ministry, is this piously sounding but deceptive shibboleth of the naked spirituality of religion. No sane person will deny that religion is spiritual. No one will deny that "God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." But when, in opposition to sacramentarian theories and to the mechanical devices of Romanism and High Churchism, the spirituality of religion is so

affirmed that the Church of Christ is divorced from Christ—when we are told that the Church is little more than a convenience, that the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper are merely institutional aids, that the ministry is a purely human institution having its origin and the reason for its existence in the needs of the Church as an organization—and that one can turn away from all these and come directly to Christ and continue spiritual communion with him and fellowship with the Holy Spirit—then it is that the true character of this thoughtless cant is revealed. It is no wonder that people take such preachers at their word and stay at home, where they can worship God as well as in the church and read better sermons sitting in an easy chair than they will hear from the unnecessary pastor, who, looking from his pulpit into an empty church, sees to his dismay the logic of his teaching.

The religion of Christ is spiritual, and where the Spirit of Christ is there is the Church. No one with the New Testament before him will look to any church or sacrament or ministry for personal salvation. Christ alone saves. The Holy Spirit regenerates, and by faith alone may we be reconciled to God by the death of his Son. But saving faith means saving obedience. Faith in Christ and at the same time willful revolt against his commandments is unthinkable. Christ established his Church. He instituted his sacraments. He did not establish either in order that they might be ignored at will by whomsoever it pleaseth. Wherever the apostles founded the Church there they gave form, body, to the revelation they

preached. Never did the apostles leave their gospel in the air. It was never, in their thought, a mere opinion about God or sin or redemption. Never did they dissociate Christ from his Church, which is his body, and for a practical working gospel which bound men together in one holy visible bond of brotherhood in Christ substitute sublimated theories, transcendental notions about spiritual affinities and relationships, which have no embodiment or visible connection with men in a visible, tangible life. Religion is not opinion. There never was a gospel separated from the Church; there never was a church separated from the historical Christ.

The creed of the apostle who more than any other accredited teacher since the prophets of Israel drew a distinction world-wide between religion and religious institutions, between spirit and letter, faith and works—the creed of Paul, the Apostle of the Spirit, is Christ. "I know," says he, not *What,* but *"Whom* I believe." "I have determined to know nothing among you," he says, "but Christ, and him crucified." The Christ of history, the Christ of the gospels, exalted to the right hand of God, the source of spiritual power in humanity, is the real object of the apostle's faith and adoration, and not a mere figment of his own subjectivity.

But even if it were true, which it can never be, that the purely human Christ which Professor Harnack extracts from the gospels is the true historical Jesus, of what surpassing value would such a Christ be to humanity? What guarantee would we then have that his ethical teachings are of practical, of infinite worth

to human kind? That in the face of the world's misfits, discords, miseries, and sin, his conceptions of God as Father are really, after all, true revelations of God's character? How do we *know* that there is mercy and forgiveness in God since we find none in nature? That all the teachings of this Christ, beautiful though they be as the loveliest dream that ever entered the human heart, his teachings on providence, on the infinite pity and boundless love of the Eternal, on the here and the hereafter, that these doctrines are, after all, absolutely true? What guarantee have we? And if we have no guarantee that they are true, what "religious warmth," what inspiration to holy living, even to "moral strictness," can come from the teachings of such a teacher that may not be obtained from Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, or the epistles of Seneca?

Such substitutes for the faith of the Church are all one with that illogical sentiment which disguises itself in France under the name of Liberal Protestantism. It is no wonder, it does not even occasion surprise, that a large section of France, rejecting the dogmas of Romanism, rejects all dogmatic religion when apparently the only representative of Protestantism there is this "Liberal Christianity" of the Protestant faculty of the University of Paris; a Christianity which is neither Christian nor Protestant, but a travesty on the name and character of both.

Professor Jean Réville, of that school, stating the principles of this new *ism,* declares that "we should be grievously mistaken were we to imagine that in these gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) we find a complete and even faithful transcription of the acts and

words of Jesus. . . . Our gospels contain many words which Jesus never uttered and many narratives which are pure legends." And yet he tells us—and we assume he is in earnest—that "in spite of this fact, by a synoptic comparison of these three gospels we may, nevertheless, succeed in reconstructing the essential features of the person of Jesus, of his teaching and work." "Nay, more," he says, "we discern them [the guiding principles and forces of the gospel] all the better for our having come to see what uncertainty surrounds the actual letter of the documents." Which is to say that the less light we have the better we can see!

And whereunto do this "Synoptic Comparison" and this better discernment lead us? They lead us, says this exponent of liberalism in France, to "condemn the view of Christianity according to which our religion requires us to accept this or that event or narrative in the gospels, such as the virgin birth, related in two quite different ways, the miracles of Jesus, which offer no guarantee of authenticity, the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the accounts of which are contradictory even in the gospels."[1]

Where, then, is the difference between this denial of all that is distinctively Christian and the ultra-rationalism of Paulus and Reimarus, of Strauss and Schenkel, and the Romanticism of Renan; between this denial of the faith and the attacks of Celsus and Porphyry on the early Church? Réville and his liberals would shelter themselves under the name of Christian, but would the Christians of the early Church

[1] *Liberal Christianity*, pp. 47, 48.

recognize their Christianity? Would Origen or Tertullian or Clement of Alexandria, or Clement of Rome, Irenæus, Justin, or Polycarp recognize either it or them? Would those martyrs who for the truth of the gospel went down in a bath of blood under Diocletian, or the multitudes of fathers and mothers, young men and women, who in the night shrieked to the Christ from their crosses of flame in Nero's garden—would these athletes of the Crucified One recognize these Parisian "liberals" as Christians? Men who deny the Christ should at least have the courage of their convictions and not sail under false colors. *Aut Christus aut nullus.*

CHAPTER II

Who Was Jesus?

The doctrine of the Incarnation as taught in the New Testament is that the Absolute God assumed human nature and was manifested in human history as a man among men. The more precise teaching is that it was the second Person in the Triune God, the Eternal Logos, the second *Persona,* or distinction of personality in Deity, who for the purpose of redeeming man from sin and the results of it assumed the nature of humanity and was manifested in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. This is the teaching of the fourth gospel. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." It is also the clear teaching of other New Testament writers. He is the Son of God (Matt. 26. 63-65). He is higher than the angels (Mark 13. 32); before him, as preparing the way of God, came the Baptist (Matt. 2. 6); he is the object of divine worship (1 Cor. 1. 2); by him, for him, and through him the universe exists (1 Cor. 8. 6); he was before all created being (Col. 1. 16); the fullness of the Godhead

dwells in him (Col. 2. 9), and to him all power in heaven and earth is given (Matt. 28. 18).

On the basis of this New Testament teaching rests the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation of God in Jesus of Nazareth.

To the modern mind with its enlarged conceptions of the universe and the long history of ages behind it in which so many religions, each asserting its divinity, and so many religious leaders, each asserting his divine mission, have come and gone, there is nothing in the realm of Christian teaching concerning which there is more conscientious doubt nor is there anything which rationalistic criticism has more strenuously endeavored to ignore, destroy, or explain away, than this marvelous teaching of the New Testament that the Infinite God entered the limits of time and space and appeared in human form.

To the average man the thought that the Absolute God was really manifested in human nature, that he was in that man Jesus of Nazareth standing there on the steps of the Temple with the multitude about him, or on yonder grassy slope preaching to peasants; in that Jesus who walked our streets and climbed our hills; who ate our meats, and drank our drinks; who loved companionship; loved children, the poor and the outcast; who went about as other men; who suffered and died at last a terrible death—this thought that in that Jesus was the Infinite Being who created and sustains all worlds, and all existences, nay, that *he was very God himself,* is the thought above all others that challenges our highest reason and makes difficult intelligent faith in the reality of the Incarna-

tion. Men seem to be able and willing to believe almost anything rather than that, for the simple reason that it transcends our intellect and baffles every attempt fully and clearly to apprehend it in its height and depth, in its glory and power.

In order to eliminate such teaching from the Christian belief, constant effort is made to destroy the trustworthy character of the gospels upon which it rests. Interpolations, misinterpretations, or erroneous readings are found or suggested wherever the text clearly affirms the faith of the Church; miracles, divine manifestations, affirmations of divinity by our Lord, everything which furnishes ground for the belief of the followers of Jesus in his Deity is set aside as poetic idealizing or the results of blending Jewish thought and Greek philosophy. There is a willingness to consider this Jesus as a prophet, one above all sages or prophets; even to think of him as a teacher who was in closer communion with God than any other among the sons of men; an unequalled and unapproachable phenomenon in human history; a richly inspired enthusiast, a humanitarian of surpassing excellence, or a spiritual genius, who forever shall have for us the value of God. But that he was truly God manifested in the flesh is vigorously denied.

It is not admitted that he was the Messiah, or that the Messianic idea itself was ever other than a patriotic Israelitish dream. Hence, every Messianic text quoted in the New Testament is disputed. Such passages it is insisted were taken out of their legitimate application and made to apply to Jesus by his ardent disciples,[1]

[1] Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, pp. 131-134.

which invention, says Dr. Martineau, was "the first deforming mask, the first robe of hopeless disguise, under which the real personality of Jesus of Nazareth disappeared from sight."[1]

Such, in brief, is the contention of rationalistic criticism. How inadequate such criticism is to the task of demolishing the truth of the gospels, supported as it is by so many converging lines of evidence, and how utterly these negative critics fail to appreciate the difficulties which their suppositions and theories originate in their endeavors to account for the beliefs and conduct of all parties and classes who act their part in these gospels, is seen in the fact that, no matter how thoroughly each successive school of destructive criticism destroys to its satisfaction the historicity of the gospel records, another school equally bent on destruction arises to point out the blunders of its predecessors. But consider some of these objections.

Dr. Menzies, for instance, himself a critic of the critics, says[2]: "If Jesus made no Messianic claim and was a teacher of humanitarian doctrine, conscious of no special religious position, how is the opposition of his fellow countrymen, and how is the crucifixion to be accounted for?" To this pertinent inquiry Professor Schmidt[3] replies that "His [Jesus's] opposition to the leading parties, his peculiar ethical teaching, and his life explain the opposition of his enemies. His crucifixion is accounted for by the false testimony borne against him and the political interests of Pilate," an explanation by no means sufficient, for it suppresses

[1] *Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 329.
[2] *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1903. [3] *Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 131.

the vital facts that the reason why the enemies of Jesus attempted to stone him, and the reason for the condemnation of him by the high priest during his trial, both of which facts are narrated by the evangelists, were based on the declaration of Jesus that he was the Son of God; that he was the Messiah. Of course the statements of the gospel may be challenged or ignored as being detrimental to preconceived notions; but even Harnack will say that such an opinion as Professor Schmidt's can be maintained only "by wrenching what the evangelists tell us off its hinges."[1]

If it is true that Jesus did not assert Messianic claims, how can the faith of the disciples in him as Messiah be accounted for? That his disciples had this belief must be admitted without question. But such a belief could never have become the property of that band of followers had Jesus not declared the fact to them during his earthly ministry and proved the same by his resurrection from the dead. For, it is self-evident that belief in his Messianic character could not have taken root among them when they saw him arrested and scourged and buffeted and subjected to all the humiliations and agonies of that dreadful night before his death. A suffering Messiah was foreign to the thought of Israel. They could not think of him as the Messiah of God when they saw him at last crucified like the criminals that hung on either side of him, and listened with pitying terror to his expiring cries, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Their hopes perished with his death. Even when he rose from the dead the Messianic belief could

[1] *What is Christianity?*, p. 133.

not have sprung up in them had not Jesus taught it to them, for the reason that there was no soil out of which such belief could spring. How could they know that he was Messiah unless he had declared it, since the conception of a Messiah who should be abandoned of God to his enemies whom he came to destroy was unknown to Jewish thought?

The Incarnation is objected to also on the ground that it is miraculous, and, as Matthew Arnold said, "Miracles do not happen." Upon the wide subject of miracles it is not our purpose to enter. But if the Incarnation is impossible because miracles are impossible, then the irrational conclusion is forced upon us that, even if Almighty God desired to incarnate himself, he could not; or, at least, if he did, it would not be possible for him to prove himself to men to be God incarnate, since every objection that is now urged again Jesus of Nazareth would be urged against him. How could God incarnated for a moral purpose prove himself to be God in any way essentially different from that seen in the life of Jesus? Is God, then, excluded from the universe because with our little definitions we make it impossible for him to enter? If behind all and through all there is an infinite Will, miracles are not only not contrary to nature but in harmony with nature; for it must be that the constitution of nature is in harmony with and responsive to the infinite Will which is in it and sustains it, so that in nowise can it obstruct an expression of that Will. There can be no contradiction between God and the universe. But since such antagonism is inconceivable, the idea that from the God-side the miraculous is impossible is also

inconceivable. From the standpoint of nature it is certainly true that "miracles do not happen," since no power can be exercised by nature greater than that which is in it. Nature has no power to do that which is contrary to itself. Hence, left to itself, nature is ever and undeviatingly uniform in its operations and can never eternally do other than it does. Almighty God, however, is greater than his creation; and the contention that anything in that creation can resist his Will should he deem it necessary to break into the continuity of natural law, *the possibility of which is involved in the moral purpose of the universe,* will not be maintained. The whole argument concerning the miraculous may be summed up in this thought: if there is an Almighty and Beneficent God, miracles are not impossible. Whether they ever occurred is another question, a question of testimony.

Turning from these arbitrary and subjective theories, what answer must be given to the inquiry, Who was Jesus, and what did he claim to be? In seeking an answer to these questions we must have recourse of necessity to the New Testament. Of course it is understood that the historical validity of the gospels is in dispute; but holding in abeyance for the present all critical questions relative to the authenticity of these documents, and the understanding of those who reported or interpreted the sayings of Jesus, and assuming for the present that we have in these gospels a correct account of the testimony of Jesus to his own person and mission, Who was Jesus, and what did he claim for himself?

Certainly the testimony of Scripture is that Jesus

claimed to be the *Messiah*. When Jesus came in the region round about Cæsarea Philippi "he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? . . . And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." That Jesus accepted this recognition of his character as correct is seen in the response of Jesus: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

He also claimed to possess *all power*. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matt. 11. 27). "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28. 18). Luke also records this saying of Jesus given in Matt. 11. 27, "All things are delivered to me of my Father" (Luke 10. 22).

He claimed to be the *Judge of all men*. This stupendous assertion is found all through the gospels (Matt. 7. 22; 10. 32; 13. 41; 16. 27; 24. 30; 25. 31-36). This consciousness of Jesus, be it observed, is that he is the *final* Judge of men and nations. He is over all in unerring wisdom and infinite holiness, and from his decision there is no appeal to any higher power.

Jesus claimed *equality with God*. This equality with God is strongly asserted. He declares that the same honor which men give to God shall be also given to him, "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men

should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him" (John 5. 22, 23). "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me," the visible manifestation of the invisible God, "whom no man can see" (John 14. 1, 23; see also 5. 18; Matt. 28. 19).

Jesus also claimed *unity with* God. "I and my Father are one"—a declaration affirming unity of essential nature. This the Jews to whom he made the declaration understood him to mean, for they said: "For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God" (John 10. 33). Many other sayings of Jesus affirming his oneness in nature and character with the Father lie scattered all through the gospels, especially in John. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (14. 9). "He that seeth me seeth him that sent me" (12. 45). It is also evident that Jesus declared his eternal *preëxistence*. "Before Abraham was, I am." "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven" (3. 13). "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (6. 38).

These are some of the tremendous claims of Jesus. Of the Scriptures not containing the words of Jesus himself but of his disciples, and of those who believed in him, which speak of him as truly *God* there are Rom. 9. 5; Col. 2. 9; Phil. 2. 6; 1 Tim. 3. 16; Titus 2. 10; Heb. 1. 8. Others attribute to him *eternity* (Col. 1. 17; Heb. 7. 3), *omnipresence* (Matt. 18. 20; John

3. 13), *omniscience* (Matt. 9. 4; Mark 2. 8; John 2. 24), which are attributes only of God. But it is solely to the express claims made by Jesus himself that we call attention. These are lofty assertions. Among different peoples in the course of ages men claiming to have a divine mission and to be able to work miracles have appeared, but never was there on earth before nor since a mere man who ever even dreamed of such astounding claims as those deliberately made and persistently preached by Jesus in the face of adamant unbelief, the religious prejudices of centuries, the profound character of the nation's belief in the spirituality and universality of God, and the seemingly clear teaching of the divine Scriptures which he held in such holy regard and from which his friends and enemies alike were never tired of quoting, "Hear, O Israel! the Lord thy God is one Lord."

To imagine that Jesus was not conscious of the magnitude of his claims, or that he was insensible to the awful sin of blasphemy, if his claims were not true, or that if he really uttered all that has been put in his mouth by the evangelists, he could not have meant that he should be understood other than in a metaphorical sense, all this is simply to underrate the moral and intellectual character of Jesus and to reduce him, the loftiest soul that ever walked this poor earth, to a level of mental and moral obtuseness lower than that of those who "took up stones to stone him," for they at least did have the intellectual ability to apprehend the significance of his words. Again and again Jesus declares his heavenly origin; over and over he repeats that he came from the Father; that he knows the

Father as none can know him: "I know whence I come and whither I go." His keen rebuke of the lack of spiritual perception in his hearers to grasp fully his thought only brings out all the more clearly the energetic God-consciousness which was ever his.

Placed now beside these majestic claims of Jesus, sustained as they were by a holiness of life which no one born of woman has yet approached, by miracles of mercy and love, by the moral power to enunciate ethical laws and to establish moral principles which have had the same redeeming power in individuals and nations centuries after he uttered them as they had in the lives of those who first heard them and surrendered to them—placed beside these claims of Jesus, to which his whole life and character and mission among men give abundant testimony, how commonplace and poverty-stricken are the findings of negative critics! According to these he was indeed a religious genius in whom the sense of God was more clear and constant than in any other among the sons of men; a prophet who brought God nearer the hearts of the masses and made them feel the reality of his presence in his universe; who with fierce enthusiasm for humanity established the spiritual kingdom of holiness and love, the kingdom of God, as an ethical ideal over against the earthly kingdoms which rest on force and oppression. He was a healer, says Bousset, a successful healer at a time when the art of medicine was in its infancy, at least in that corner of the world where Jesus lived. "His method of healing may be called a psychical one; he stirred the forces of the inner life so powerfully that they reacted on the outward bodily life. He

healed the sick by his immovable faith in his heavenly Father and the divine force working in him, and by awakening in the maimed and suffering the same faith in himself as the messenger of God. Thus his healing activity lies entirely within the bounds of what is psychologically conceivable, and this feature of the life of Jesus has nothing absolutely unique about it."[1] He did not claim to be God or to be equal with God. "The Almighty God remained before his eyes a sublime and lofty presence; he did not presume to place himself by his side." He did not claim to be Messiah, and "above all, he did not lay claim to the Judgeship of the world, although that conception was, strictly speaking, included in that of the Son of man."

Such is the Jesus of negative criticism. How is such a portrait obtained? Chiefly by methods of historical and literary criticism in the hands of biased critics who, denying the supernatural to begin with, rigorously exclude from the texts of the gospels whatever is contrary to their scientific view of the world; or, denying the essential Deity of Jesus, assign to myth-making New Testament writers those texts which the writers themselves declare were spoken by Jesus. A fine example of this easy method is seen in Professor N. Schmidt's *Prophet of Nazareth,* p. 124. Referring to those texts in which the phrase "Son of man" occurs, Professor Schmidt says: "It is impossible to study even these passages occurring only in one gospel without being impressed with the freedom with which sayings of Jesus were modified as they passed from lip

[1] Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 49, Eng. trans. See also Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 265.

to lip and new ones were created. Among the eight passages found only in Matthew and Luke, Matt. 8. 20 (Luke 9. 58), 11. 19 (7. 34), and 12. 32a (12. 10a) probably go back to original sayings of Jesus, as we have seen; 12. 40 (11. 30) is an interpolation, as is generally recognized; 24. 27, 37, 39 (17. 24, 25, 30) belong to the synoptic Apocalypse, and 29. 44 (12. 46) is a later gloss, as Jülicher has recognized."

Bousset furnishes another example. Referring to the birth narratives he writes: "The two accounts are absolutely contradictory and represent two separate attempts at reconciling the older tradition that Nazareth was Jesus's birthplace with the latter assumption that, as "Messiah, he must have been born at Bethlehem."[1] "That Jesus was directly indicated by John as Messiah, as the Christian tradition has it, we do not believe." "It must not be forgotten that the Jewish conception of the Man-Messiah embraced within itself the claims to preëxistence and the judgeship of the world, whereas, according to the surest tradition of our earliest gospels, it never occurred to Jesus to attribute a primeval existence to himself. . . . Jesus never made any claim to be the future Judge of the world, although our first three gospels, following the belief of the community, certainly represent him as making it."

And so we might continue. But if this rationalistic Jesus is the historic Jesus, if this self-deceived, self-adjusting, misrepresented, and misunderstood Jesus

[1] It seems that it never occurred to Prof. Bousset what extraordinary intellectual genius was displayed in the attempt to reconcile (?) two "absolutely contradictory" accounts of the same event by *preserving both!*

who is forced by circumstances to play a Messianic *rôle* he never intended is really the Jesus that revealed God to humanity, who lifted heavy burdens and the shadows of death from the lives of men and women, who gave to nations and races renewed vigor, and brought on the stage of the world by his teaching a civilization which, whatever may be its defects in its effort to overcome the inwrought crudeness and savagery of humanity, nevertheless bears within itself, at the heart of it, the promise and potency of final victory over evil forces which war against the social and moral wellbeing of man—if this purely human Jesus of rationalism is the real Jesus of the gospels, then we have most admirably succeeded not in discovering this Jesus, for he is yet to be accounted for, but primarily in escaping from one set of difficulties only to become inextricably enmeshed in another. For this Jesus of rationalism must also do things. Somebody with skill and power greater than any that this world ever felt before or since did things in those gospel days, and if the Jesus of the gospels did not lift empires off their hinges or change the current of human history by the divinity of his person, then perhaps this Jesus of rationalism did. But is he equal to the task? Does this Jesus sufficiently account even for Pentecost? How can we with any respect for psychology, with any regard for the primal principles of human nature account for the faith of his disciples in such a Jesus?

It is quite possible, as instances of our own day show, that neurotics, victims of hysteria, poetic dreamers of social Utopias, enthusiasts, and idealists of

every variety may be swept beyond the bounds of sanity by the impact of a new idea at the exact psychological moment, and ever after, even in spite of failure, in the teeth of universal ridicule, contempt, persecution, and death, attempt to glorify their idealized, but perhaps very common and ordinary, leader. History is full of the heroisms of fanaticism. Nor is martyrdom the monopoly of any sect. The passion flower grows in all lands. A willingness to endure either the dungeon or the stake, while it may serve to demonstrate the loyalty of a devotee, is no proof of the divinity of a faith; for there was never yet an idea concocted in the brain of a lunatic which, if persistently preached, would not at length gather to itself believers, defenders, and martyrs.

But it is evident from the record that the hard-headed, practical-minded disciples whom Jesus called to his side were the farthest possible removed from the category of visionaries. They were Galileans, and if fanatical at all, it was not in direction of the superhuman but in the very mundane specialty of politics and bread. They were workingmen, fishermen, not artists chiselling beautiful sculptures on the marbles of Herod's palace at Cæsarea. They were unlettered men, sons of the common people, accustomed to the sensible, material side of life; slow to understand, and slower yet to believe in ideas and psychic situations beyond their level of ordinary thinking and living. We find them sharing in the crude beliefs of their countrymen concerning the coming Messianic kingdom and the supremacy of Israel over the Gentiles. They are not remarkably responsive, owing to lack

of imagination, to spiritual conceptions, or to the necessity of self-renunciation for the attainment of ethical ends (Matt. 16. 22), and are constantly inquiring among themselves and of the Master concerning the meaning of his most obvious teaching. So little do they live in the future, notwithstanding Renan's artistic description of the first days of the founding of the kingdom, which Réville in his review of the *Vie de Jésu* aptly designates as "Christianity in Dresden China," "pic-nic Christianity," and so ready are they to abandon such hopes as may have fitfully gleamed on their spiritual horizon when a "hard saying" or an eclipse of popularity disturbed their confidence, or the appalling tragedy of Calvary shatters their expectations, that they immediately make ready, even though it be with heavy and disappointed hearts, to take up again the everyday work and toil of the commonplace life they had left when Jesus first called them by the Galilean Sea. Does the Jesus of rationalism account for the disciples and for the faith which inspired them? Does he account for Paul the apostle to the Gentiles?

Paul is a true son of Israel. He is a monotheist. Not only does he believe there is but one God, but a personal distinction in the being of God would be resisted by him as another form of polytheism destructive of the unity of God. He is a cultured man, this Paul, a ripe product of Jewish learning at a time when it was liberalized by contact with foreign thought. He is not a stranger to the religious and philosophical theories of his day. He can speak Greek, and is acquainted with Greek culture and

literature. But neither his residence among the Gentiles nor his study of foreign thought has cooled the ardor of his patriotism. He is an intense patriot, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, showing his love and loyalty to the aspirations and hopes of Israel by his religious earnestness and his bitter antagonism to the followers of Jesus. Probably had it not been for him, Jerusalem would have been won for Christ. When, owing to the preaching of the apostles, a great company of priests and Levites had believed and when in all the synagogues and throughout the city the wonderful Jesus and his teaching were the theme of inquiry and discussion, then it was that Paul stirred up the persecution against Stephen which resulted in his death and the dispersion of believers from Jerusalem, now firmly in the grip of the authorities and a relentless inquisitor. But the time came when this arch enemy of the growing Church, this Hebrew of the Hebrews with ingrained contempt for the heathen, became the bond-slave of Jesus Christ, the tireless apostle of the Gentiles, and the chief expounder of the divine nature and redemptive mission of Jesus of Nazareth. How was this change brought about? Was a humanitarian prophet, a mere religious reformer, equal to such a change in such a man who in his exposition of the nature of this human Jesus declares him to be the Son of God, the visible reality in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, the Redeemer of humanity, the Judge of men and angels, God over all blessed for ever? Look at this man Paul as he traverses the Roman empire; travel with him in all his weary wanderings in lands near

and remote from Jerusalem to Rome; witness his labors and conflicts, his hardships by land and sea, "in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft." "Of the Jews," said he, "five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep. In journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren. In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness, besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily the care of all the churches." At length, after years of toil and suffering, Paul, now Paul the aged, gray-haired and scarred all over, is in the Mamertine Prison at the foot of the Capitoline Hill awaiting death and writing his final testimony to Timothy his son in the gospel, saying, "I know whom I have believed and that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. I am now ready to be offered up and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Then, on the yellow sand beyond the Ostian Gate he bends his neck to the edge of the sword and his warfare is finished!

Let the history of such a man declare whether the

Jesus of modern day rationalism is a sufficient explanation of such a life and such an experience!

But in addition to all this the insurmountable difficulty which confronts the rationalistic critic is how to destroy effectually the evidence from prophecy. Here is testimony which appeals to the modern mind with a force greater than was possible at any previous age, for we have climbed higher peaks and enjoy wider sky lines. The history of humanity is seen in a clearer light, the forces which moved men and nations are better understood; the exactness of scientific thought renders less possible the confusion and blending of chance and coincidence with the intentional and designed; while time itself, with its wrecks and ruins of things that were, has separated the temporal from the eternal and in its accumulations of the ages has furnished the student of history and philosophy with means for ascertaining truth not possible to those of earlier days.

Now, leaving for the present all questions of criticism and reading the prophecies in the Old Testament as they are there recorded, what kind of a person, what are his characteristics, and what is his mission, and what are the chief events, and what are the incidental details of his life, and what is the outcome or future of this unique personality which these prophecies demand? We do not inquire now whether these requirements have ever been met, the simple question is, What is demanded by these Old Testament prophecies all taken together? He must be born at a definite time in the history of the world. He must be born of a virgin at Bethlehem. He must be a supernatural

being. A marvelous teacher of righteousness, a miracle worker, healing the sick, giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf. He must be hailed as the Messiah King. He must be rejected by the Jewish nation, betrayed by an individual, sold for thirty pieces of silver, crucified, but strange to say, not a bone of him must be broken. He must die not for his own sins, but for the sins of the people. He must rise from the dead and ascend into the heavens. He must, notwithstanding his rejection and death, establish on earth an everlasting kingdom which shall survive all kingdoms. His name must grow greater as the ages flit by. The kings of the earth and the glory of the nations must come to him, and in him all men find the eternal peace, the reign of God in their hearts. These are but a few of the requirements of prophecy. They were made ages—the very latest of them perhaps four hundred years—before Jesus of Nazareth came on the scene.

Now, do these prophecies find their fulfillment in him? The only way possible to answer this for ourselves is to turn to the facts given by the writers of the New Testament and to the unwritten fulfillment of prophecy in all the ages since Jesus ascended the heavens. Compare, then, the prophecies of the Old Testament and their recorded fulfillments in the New.[1]

In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. *Gen.* xii, 3. In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. *Gen.* xxii, 18; xxviii, 14.

The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, . . . the son of Abraham. *Matt.* i, 1. Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. *Acts* iii, 25.

[1] Keith, *Prophecy.*

Judah, thou *art he* whom thy brethren shall praise: the scepter shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come. *Gen.* xlix, 8, 10.

It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah. *Heb.* vii, 14. Salvation is of the Jews' *John* iv, 22. The Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book. *Rev.* v, 5.

There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. There shall be a root of Jesse, . . . *Isa.* xi, 1, 10.

Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles. *Rom.* xv, 12; *Matt.* i, 5, 16. To David also he gave testimony, and said, I have found David the son of Jesse, a man which shall fulfill all my will. *Acts* xiii, 22.

When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, etc. *Gal.* iv, 4.

Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore . . . that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. *Luke* i, 34, 35.

Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. *Isa.* vii, 14.

Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us. *Matt.* i, 22, 23.

Thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting. *Micah* v, 2. He shall be

Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king, etc. *Matt.* ii, 1; *Luke* ii, 11.

In the beginning was the Word: The same was in the beginning with God. *John* i, 1, 2. Jesus Christ the same yester-

called, The Lord [*Jehovah*] our Righteousness. *Jer.* xxiii, 6.

Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father [or the Father of the everlasting age], The Prince of Peace. *Isa.* ix, 6.

I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. *Psa.* ii, 7.

In the days of these kings [or empires, of which the Roman was the last] shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. *Dan.* ii, 44.

Lo, I come: in the volume of the book *it is* written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart. *Psa.* xl, 7, 8.

Who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? He is rejected of men. *Isa.* liii, 1, 3.

He [my messenger] shall prepare the way before me. *Mal.* iii, 1. He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers. *Mal.* iv, 6. Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. *Isa.* xl, 3.

day, and to-day, and for ever. *Heb.* xiii, 8.

The Word was with God, and the Word was God. The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. *John* i, 1, 14. Unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. *Luke* ii, 11.

We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. *John* i, 14. He shall be called the Son of the Highest. *Luke* i, 32.

In those days came John the Baptist, saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. *Matt.* iii, 1, 2. The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard-seed, which, when it is grown, is the greatest among herbs. *Matt.* xiii, 31, 32.

I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. *John* vi, 38. Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work. *John* iv, 34.

He came unto his own, and his own received him not. *John* i, 11. Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him. *John* xii, 37.

Jesus went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized; and there he abode. And many resorted unto him, and said, John did no miracle: but all things that John spake of this man were true. And many believed on him there. *John* x, 34, 40, 42.

I have put my Spirit upon him. *Isa.* xlii, 1.	The heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. *Matt.* iii, 16.
The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him. *Isa.* xi, 2.	He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. *John* iii, 34.
The rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against his Anointed. *Psa.* ii, 2.	We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ [or the anointed]. *John* i, 41. I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ. This is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world. *John* iv, 25, 42.
The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me.	There was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, etc. And he began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears. *Luke* iv, 17–21.
To *preach* good tidings unto the meek;	The poor have the gospel preached to them. *Matt.* xi, 5. He went throughout every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God. *Luke* viii, 1.
He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted,	Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. *Matt.* xi, 28.
To proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;	Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. *John* viii, 34, 36.
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord,	If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! *Luke* xix, 42.
And the day of vengeance of our God;	For the days shall come upon thee that thine enemies shall lay thee even with the ground, be-

	cause thou knewest not the time of thy visitation. *Luke* xix, 43, 44. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. *Luke* xxi, 22.
To comfort all that mourn;	Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted. *Matt.* v, 4.
To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. *Isa.* lxi, 1, 2, 3.	Blessed are ye, when *men* shall persecute you, etc. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven. Vers. 11, 12.
The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord;	He knew what was in man. *John* vi, 25. All that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. *Luke* ii, 47.
And shall make him of quick understanding, in the fear of the Lord;	No man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any *man* ask him any more *questions*. *Matt.* xxii, 46; *Mark* xii, 34.
And he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes,	When thou wast under the fig-tree I saw thee. *John* i, 48. This poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury, *Mark* xii, 43. Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment. *John* vii, 24.
Neither reprove after the hearing of his ears. *Isa.* xi, 2, 3.	And Jesus, knowing their thoughts, said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? *Matt.* ix, 4. He that dippeth *his* hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. *Matt.* xxvi, 23.
He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street.	His brethren said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judea, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. If thou do these things, show thyself to the world. Then went he up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret. *John* vii, 3–10.

A bruised reed shall he not break,

A woman, which was a sinner, stood at his feet behind *him* weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe *them* with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed *them* with the ointment. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace. *Luke* vii, 37, 38, 48, 50.

And the smoking [or dimly burning] flax shall he not quench. *Isa.* xlii, 2, 3.

Mary sat at Jesus's feet, and heard his word. But Martha came to him, and said, Lord, bid her that she help me. And Jesus answered, But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her. *Luke* x, 39, 40, 42. Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. *John* vi, 37.

Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. *Isa.* lv, 1.

Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled. *Matt.* v, 6. Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, etc. *John* iv, 14. In the last day, that great *day* of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. *John* vii, 37.

Wherefore do ye spend money for *that which is not* bread? and your labor for *that which* satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye *that which is* good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. *Isa.* lv, 2.

Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you. *John* vi, 27. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. Ver. 51. The words that I speak unto you, *they* are spirit and they are life. Ver. 63.

He had done no violence,

Then said Pilate, I find no fault in this man. *Luke* xxiii, 4. [Judas said], I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. *Matt.* xxvii, 4. Such a high priest became us,

Neither *was any* deceit in his mouth. *Isa.* liii, 9.

who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. *Heb.* vii, 26.

Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not. 1 *Pet.* ii, 22, 23.

I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. *Ezek.* xxxiv, 23. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd. *Isa.* xl, 11.

I am the good shepherd. By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. *John* x, 9, 11, 14. He calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out. And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him, etc. *Ibid.*, vers. 3, 4. Our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep. *Heb.* xiii, 20; 1 *Pet.* ii, 25.

And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd. *Ezek.* xxxvii, 24.

There shall be one fold, and one shepherd. *John* x, 16.

He shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom. *Isa.* xl, 11.

Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not. He took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them. *Mark* x, 14, 16. Feed my lambs. *John* xxi, 15.

Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. *Psa.* cxviii, 26.

And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees, and strewed them in the way. And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. *Matt.* xxi, 8, 9. Blessed be the kingdom of our father David. *Mark* xi, 10. Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King

cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass; and upon a colt the foal of an ass. *Zech.* ix, 9.

The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. *Mal.* iii, 1.

The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up. *Psa.* lxix, 9. He is like a refiner's fire: he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver. *Mal.* iii, 2, 3.

The eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame *man* leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing. *Isa.* xxxv, 5, 6. In that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity, and out of darkness. *Isa.* xxix, 18.

Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. *Zech.* xiii, 7.

And I will turn mine hand upon the little ones. *Ibid.*

Mark xi, 9. And the disciples brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set him thereon. *Matt.* xxi, 6, 7.

And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple. *Mark* xi, 11. And he taught daily in the temple. *Luke* xix, 47.

And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves. *Matt.* xxi, 12. When he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple. *John* ii, 15.

Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up. *Matt.* xi, 5. And Jesus went about all Galilee, healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. *Matt.* iv, 23. And great multitudes came unto him, having with them *those that were* lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet, and he healed them; insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see. *Matt.* xv, 30, 31.

Judas came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, etc. All the disciples forsook him and fled. *Matt.* xxvi, 47, 56.

Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure

He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. *Isa.* liii, 7.

He is despised and rejected: he was despised, and we esteemed him not. *Isa.* liii, 3. Thus saith the Lord, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth. *Isa.* xlix, 7.

They weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver;—a goodly price that I was prized at of them. *Zech.* xi, 12, 13.

And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter;—and I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord. *Zech.* xi, 13.

When we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. *Isa.* liii, 2.

He is rejected of men;—we hid as it were our faces from him. *Ibid.*, ver. 3.

to give you the kingdom. *Luke* xii, 32.

When he was accused, he answered nothing. Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? And he answered him never a word. *Matt.* xxvii, 12–14. He held his peace, and answered nothing. *Mark* xiv, 61; *John* xix, 9.

Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil? *John* viii, 48. And he [Pilate] saith unto the Jews, Behold your King! But they cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him. *John* xix, 14, 15.

And he said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. *Matt.* xxvi, 15.

Then Judas, which had betrayed him, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood. And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. *Matt.* xxvii, 3, 5, 6, 7.

Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man! *John* xix, 5.

When the chief priests therefore and officers saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him. Away with him,

away with him, crucify him. *John* xix, 6, 15. They had then a notable prisoner called Barabbas. The governor said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. *Matt.* xxvii, 16, 21.

He was taken from prison and from judgment: he was cut off out of the land of the living. *Isa.* liii, 8.

Saith Pilate unto him, Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee? Pilate brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment seat, etc. Then delivered he him unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus, and led him away. *John* xix, 10, 13, 16.

I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair:

Pilate took Jesus, and scourged him. And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on his head. And they smote him with their hands. *John* xix, 1, 2, 3. They buffeted him, and others smote him with the palms of their hands. *Matt.* xxvi, 67.

I hid not my face from shame and spitting. *Isa.* i, 6.

And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him. *Mark* xiv, 65.

They bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. *Matt.* xxvii, 29, 30.

O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass. *Zech.* ix, 9. Shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself. *Dan.* ix, 26.

Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt. *John* xii, 15.

And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS. *John* xix, 19.

They part my garments among them,

Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also his coat: now the coat was without seam, woven from the

And cast lots upon my vesture. *Psa.* xxii, 18.	top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the Scripture might be fulfilled. *John* xix, 23, 24.
They pierced my hands and my feet. *Psa.* xxii, 16.	They crucified him. *John* xix, 18. Behold my hands and my feet. *Luke* xxiv, 39. Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side. *John* xx, 27.
He was numbered with the transgressors. *Isa.* liii, 12.	A friend of publicans and sinners. *Matt.* xi, 19. Then were two thieves crucified with him; one on the right hand, and another on the left. *Matt.* xxvii, 38.
They gave me also gall for my meat;	And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, they give him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink. *Matt.* xxvii, 33, 34.
And in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink. *Psa.* lxix, 21.	After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar; and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth. When Jesus, therefore, had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished. *John* xix, 28, 30.
He keepeth all his bones: not one of them is broken. *Psa.* xxxiv, 20. Neither shall ye break a bone thereof [of the Paschal Lamb]. *Exod.* xii, 46.	The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs. *John* xix, 31–33.

They shall look upon me whom they have pierced. *Zech.* xii, 10.

But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, etc. *John* xix, 34.

He made his grave with the wicked,

And with the rich in his death. *Isa.* liii, 9.

Then were there two thieves crucified with him. *Matt.* xxvii, 38.

When the even was come, a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb. *Matt.* xxvii, 57 58, 60.

We did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. *Isa.* liii, 4.

Christ redeemed us, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. *Gal.* iii, 13.

Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin. *Isa.* liii, 10.

Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. *John* xii, 27. My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. *Matt.* xxvi, 38.

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? *Psa.* xxii, 1.

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? *Matt.* xxvii, 46; *Mark* xv, 34.

He was cut off out of the land of the living. *Isa.* liii, 8.

He bowed his head and gave up the ghost. *John* xix, 30.

My flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. *Psa.* xvi, 9, 10.

When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall prolong his days. *Isa.* liii, 10.

He showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs. *Acts* i, 3. He [David] spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell [hades, the state of the dead], neither his flesh did see corruption. *Acts* ii, 31. He rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures. 1 *Cor.* xv, 4.

Thou hast ascended on high,

He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. *Luke* xxiv, 51. While they be-

held, he was taken up. *Acts* i, 9. After the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. *Mark* xvi, 19.

Here, then, are remarkable prophecies and wonderful fulfillments. They are remarkable in detail, in descriptions of personal characteristics, in statements of personal acts which depend on so many external conditions, that it is not possible to regard these prophecies as applicable to the Israelitish nation. They are prophecies of a person. Is that person the Jesus of rationalism or the Jesus of the gospels? To deny that these prophecies were ever made of a person who should come, or that they were fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth is puerile. For, we see for ourselves that these prophecies of one who should be rejected by his people, and put to death, but one nevertheless whose kingdom should become a universal kingdom, a kingdom of righteousness and peace, one to whom the kings of the Gentiles should come in the brightness of his rising, one who should be the teacher of nations, the helper of men, are fulfilled in this historic Jesus even had the gospel writers never written a line on the fulfillment of prophecy. We are not solely dependent on the quotations of the evangelists in this respect. We see what they never saw—the full meaning of Old Testament prophecy concerning the universal sway of Christ's kingdom. There is that in human history which, ignoring the infallibility of critics and the theories of the schools, is unceasingly building the kingdom of God on the lines laid down by Jesus Christ,

and he is ever growing larger with every new morning that dawns on the earth. How, then, is it that these prophecies and all that belongs to the Christian ages fit into the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth *and into no one else?* How is it that he only of all who have ever since lived answer to all the requirements even to the minutest detail of these old prophecies? Even if we agree with extreme rationalism that these prophecies were never of a person, that as Professor N. Schmidt says, the Messianic idea was never anything more than a Jewish dream, how can we then account for the astounding fact that if they did relate to a person, the historic facts in the life of Jesus would be their literal fulfillment? If we deny also that the "historic facts" in the life of Jesus ever occurred but were invented by his followers, the denial will solve no difficulty, for then we shall have the disciples of Jesus inventing a life of Jesus which is made to fit into Old Testament prophecy concerning the regenerating power of the Messiah, his teaching and expanding influence in the world—and all the ages since the gospel was written actually conspiring to make it true! How did the evangelists and apostles know what future ages would show? But if there is anything more demonstrable than another, it is that Jesus is on the throne of the world and that his words are the molding forces of humanity. The prophecies of Israel fit into the facts of the gospel and the development of history, and from these two facts there can be no appeal to the fanciful theories of unbelief.

Who, then, was Jesus? From the interrogative of Jesus, "Whom say ye that I am?" there is no escape.

We cannot manufacture a Jesus, as a carpenter on the Ganges or the Yangtse saws a god out of a log, and deceive ourselves in the belief that this is the real historic Jesus and that in him we have salvation. The Jesus of the gospels is the Jesus of the epistles. In both he is declared to be God manifested in the flesh and in that Jesus only have we a knowledge of God, communion with God, and personal salvation. We do not find the God of the heart in nature, but rather the God of power, since nature hides God as much as it reveals him. He is not in the whirlwind, nor in the fire, nor in the earthquake, but in the heart of man where is heard the still, small voice. It is therefore in *life* that God comes to us. But the historic life of Jesus is the only life set before us as a revelation of God to man. It is only in that life, therefore, that we see the God of love, he who forgives us our sins when we come home to him, who makes known to us his holy will and saving grace.

Jesus was the visible evidence of God's forgiveness. It is *God himself* coming near to us in human appearance and making plain to us what could not be otherwise so fully revealed or made so absolutely certain. In him therefore the revelation of God becomes to the earnest mind a joyous certainty, and by faith in the reality of God's willingness to forgive, forgiveness is no longer an idea or a hope outside of us, but an indubitable fact in religious experience.

Now, take that Jesus out of the gospels and substitute for him another Jesus of our own making, and what guarantee, what fact have we that can make certain to us as nothing else can that God is in very

truth such a God at all as is revealed to us in the Jesus of the New Testament? We have absolutely no such fact anywhere. Of what value to us, then, is the "Jesus" of rationalism?

It will no doubt be objected to here that this is establishing religious experience upon a past event and not upon a present reality; that it does not even rest upon a person but upon the statements of others concerning that person, and therefore is dependent, finally, upon the historical value of the records. This is the contention of those who, rejecting the Jesus of the gospels in obedience to the newer criticism, still try to hold communion with God and to live the Christ life, a position not unlike that of one who eagerly drinks of the refreshing stream and yet denies the spring. According to strict method discussion of this belongs elsewhere, but we may say that the objection is groundless. The Jesus of the gospels is the same Jesus exalted to the right hand of the Father, and to the eye of faith he is ever a present Jesus. He is not a past event but a living, present fact. Christian experience, therefore, does not rest altogether and only upon a record, upon the historical accuracy of this or that detail, incident, name, or date, but upon essential fact, or content of the record.

The records left us by the evangelists bear a relation to us similar to that which Jesus held to those who saw him in the flesh. He was in general appearance like other men. But looking upon that face, hearing that voice, or feeling the velvet touch of his hands in healing power, was not really seeing or apprehending the real Christ; wherefore Paul wrote,

"Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more." And yet had there been no Christ in the flesh, there would have been no Christ of the Spirit. The real Jesus was not what men saw with their eyes, but the visible Jesus plus the invisible God. Hence, those only who, like Peter, discerned the divine in the human really apprehended the personality of Jesus. The human was the bearer of the divine. So the records. The real gospel is not in dates, in this or that variation, in the tenses of verbs, or the cases of nouns, but in the Fact, in the full Content of the message which the gospels contain. Had there been no record, we should not have known the Fact, but our Christian experience does not, therefore, rest upon the record only but upon the Fact or Content of the record, just as looking upon Christ in the flesh was not apprehending Christ unless there was spiritual perception of Christ's divine nature and mission and a surrender of the life to the wonderful Fact thus perceived.

The things which were not written of Jesus, but which he did, and of which the world, says Saint John, could not contain the books that might be written, were just as true as those that were written. But surely religious experience does not rest upon the unknown. But that Jesus lived, that he founded the kingdom of God, that he was God manifested in the flesh, that in his atoning blood we have redemption from sin, and through him eternal life, all of which is involved in the person and self-revelation of Jesus—upon these vital and inexpungeable facts of the gospel record faith does stand, and stands serene and confi-

dent as to the results of literary or historical criticism of the records, because it knows by experience that Jesus Christ is now a present Saviour and that in him men do find forgiveness of sins and the peace that passeth understanding.

This Christian experience, however, is not that of an individual, eccentric in character, perhaps, and peculiar to himself. Just as in the field of physical science the data received from experimenters in laboratories in all parts of the world are checked off and that only which is common to all is accepted as fact, so that only which is the universal experience of Christians is Christian experience, the experience of the Body of Christ, thus excluding the aberrations of sects and abnormal defections from historic Christianity; and this is the testimony of the Church, wherever the Spirit of God was not quenched, in all lands, among all peoples, back through all time down to the Day of Pentecost on which same experience on that day the Church was founded and the kingdom of God opened to all believers. So much for the objection from Christian experience. But as against rationalism it must be seen that had there been no divine Jesus there could have been no Christian experience.

The Jesus of rationalism could never have made Pentecost possible. There was not enough in him to produce such an experience. The Jesus of Pentecost is a Risen Lord. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death because it was not possible that he should be

holden of it. . . . This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." But neither Harnack, nor Schmiedel, nor Bousset, nor Schmidt, nor any of the modern liberal school present us a Risen Jesus. Whence it is clear from the declaration of Peter that had there been no Jesus risen from the dead there would have been no Pentecost. A dead Jesus was a dead hope. On the other hand, the Jesus of the gospels is the only explanation of that marvelous event in the world's history and consequently of all that has since flowed from it in the history of the Christian world.

CHAPTER III

The Virgin Birth and Hebrew Sources

The position assumed by rationalistic critics of an extreme type, such as Schmiedel,[1] Gunkel,[2] Usener,[3] Cheyne,[4] Winckler,[5] and others, seems to be that every remarkable representation in the Old and New Testaments, particularly of persons, which is not on all fours with the commonplace must have had its origin, not in historic fact, but in Babylonian, Egyptian, or Iranian hero legends. To this general assumption the virgin birth of our Lord is made no exception. It is assumed that the angelic announcement, the title of his mother as "The Virgin," the overshadowing of the Highest, the star, the Magi, the slaughter of the innocents, the flight into Egypt—all have their counterpart in the fables of the gods and owe their existence to the influence of the Oriental mythologies on Israelitish belief.

It is not necessary to single out the particular contribution of each recent critic to this new modification of the long since discarded theories of the Tubingen school. Perhaps in quite recent literature, however,

[1] *Encyclopedia Biblica.*

[2] *Zum religions geschichtlichen Verstandniss das N. T.* Göttingen: 1903.

[3] *Encyclopedia Biblica.* Article Nativity.

[4] *Bible Problems,* etc.

[5] *Die Heilinschiften,* 8.379, Zimmern-Winckler. See also Pfleiderer, *Das Unschrisentum,* Berlin, 1902; von W. Soltau, *Die Geburtgeschichte Jesu Christ.* Leipzig, 1902.

there are not to be found more subtle or more determined efforts to discredit the historical statements of Matthew and Luke concerning the birth of Christ than those of Professor Paul Lobstein,[1] of the Protestant faculty of Strasburg, and Professor T. K. Cheyne,[2] of Oxford, although we might include the recent work on identical lines by Pfleiderer,[3] of Berlin. The special value of their works, however, as real additions to our knowledge of the subject is not great. A cursory examination of Lobstein's volume shows it to be little more than an echo of Keim's *History of Jesus of Nazareth,* where Lobstein's ideas and much more are mapped out by a master hand. The mythical theory of Strauss, so ingeniously applied in his *Leben Jesu,* did suggest, on the basis of the Hegelian philosophy, some shadowy resemblance to probability till the common sense of universal scholarship resolved it into airy nothing, but the poor imitation of the Protestant professor of Strasburg, and of Cheyne of Oxford, who is dependent upon him for his modified definition of "myth," as Lobstein is upon Keim, has neither critical skill in its construction, nor philosophical acumen in its elaboration.

The historical statements of Matthew and Luke concerning the birth of our Lord are before us, and the simple question is: How are we to account for these statements, which seem to form an integral part of their gospels? The theory of Lobstein is that these narratives are not integral parts of these gospels, espe-

[1] *The Virgin Birth of Christ; An Historical and Critical Essay.*
[2] *Bible Problems, and the New Material for their Solution.*
[3] *Early Christian Conceptions of the Christ.*

cially that of Luke, but are later additions; that they were unknown to the immediate circle of Christ's followers; that when the metaphysical doctrine of Christ's personality was formulated through the influence of the Alexandrian philosophy of the Logos, then this physical miracle of his birth was worked up or adapted from material already existing in the Old Testament to explain his divine Sonship. By a process of verbal reasoning to which apparently facts do not seem to be at all necessary, Lobstein endeavors to make it appear that this conscious myth-making was in no sense a deliberate intent to deceive. This colorless disposition to ascribe supernatural origin to extraordinary character, he affirms, was simply an inheritance. "It is well known," he observes, "that the religious genius of Israel, as indeed the religious sense in general, is essentially characterized by its suppression of all secondary causes and its demonstration of the direct action of the will of God in all things. The historians of the theocracy, bent on pointing out divine intervention in the history of the chosen people, frequently try to discover at the outset of the lives of the national and religious heroes extraordinary signs of providential intervention. But the editors of the historical books of the Old Testament were merely the interpreters of the popular faith. This faith, taking a poetic form in myths, often penetrated with deep or naive religious inspiration, hailed the appearance of its liberators and prophets as a manifestation of deliverance on the part of Jahweh or as the realization of some divine purpose. The birth of these chosen instruments of the Eternal could be nothing short of the

result of a sovereign and merciful act of the God of Israel. The poetic traditions which surround the cradles of Isaac, Samson, and Samuel are the outcome of this religious instinct, which spoke by turns the language of pastoral poetry, of warlike epic, or of prophetic lyricism.

"From the religion of Israel this religious conception passed into the consciousness of early Christianity and inspired the piety of the men of the new covenant."

Therefore, "If the faith of Israel invested the ancestors and heroes of the nation with a privilege which at the outset set a divine seal upon them, is it surprising that the Christian consciousness, absolutely convinced of the divine nature of the work and inspiration of Christ, should have attempted to explain the birth and nature of the Messiah by a greater miracle than any which had presided over the origin of the most famous prophets? Being greater than those who *received* the Holy Spirit from their earliest infancy, he was *conceived* by the Holy Spirit; his life proceeds directly from the life of God himself; his entire personality is an immediate creation of the divine activity; the primitive and essential relationship which unites Jesus to God is not only a bond of spiritual sonship, it embraces the life of the body no less than that of the soul; the divine Sonship of Jesus is a physical filiation.

"Thus understood, the fact of the miraculous birth of Christ is only the material expression of an experience of the Christian consciousness.

"It is therefore unnecessary to resort to the hypothesis of pagan influences or of Hellenic or Oriental

factors in order to explain the origin of the belief in the supernatural birth of Christ. The tradition consecrated by our gospels, the myth with which faith in the divine Sonship of Jesus is poetically invested, has its roots deep down in Israel's religion transformed by the new faith. The dogma of the supernatural birth is the result of the union of traditional interpretation with the Christian principle."

Now, it is certainly an interesting phenomenon in the history of human error when one, presumably in the interest of truth, deliberately sets aside historical evidences and, as a spider spins his web from his own substance, invents a theory which not only destroys the reality of historic facts but also, without any rational ground whatsoever, attributes motives, philosophical notions and religious conceptions to a people who never dreamed of the notions and motives and religious poetizing so readily credited to them. But it is equally remarkable that any reputable scholar should be in such slight touch with his own age, should so greatly underestimate its sanity and practical character, as to imagine that it is still possible in this scientific period to substitute such mystic poetry, such twilight dreamings, for the hard and dry facts of sober history. No ingenious phrasing, philosophical disquisition on the origin and growth of myths, philological jugglery, or skillful selection of sentimental or diplomatic terms to soften the shock to Christian feeling can ever conceal the fact, if Lobstein's theory is correct, that those who invented the narratives of Christ's birth in the gospels of Matthew and Luke were undoubtedly guilty of conscious fraud.

The evangelist Luke knew the facts or he did not. He affirms that he did. In the preface to his gospel he assures Theophilus of his accuracy and of his painstaking care in ascertaining the facts. What he writes is written also with full knowledge of what others had written on the same subject.

Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us,

Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word;

It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus,

That thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed.

Here, then, is the clear statement of a credible historian whose earnestness of manner, clarity of style, and personal interest in the one he is addressing unconsciously reveal the candor and good faith which inspired him. A study of his exact words, selected by him with precision, shows that he anticipates and guards against the suspicion of dealing in adapted myths or hoary legends. He first states that in his investigation of the truth of "things which are *fully established* [πεπληροφορημένων] among us"[1] he "accurately traced" all (πᾶσιν) these things personally

[1] It would most unquestionably be an argument of decisive weight in favor of the credibility of the biblical history could it be shown that it was written by eye witnesses, or even by persons nearly contemporaneous with the events narrated.—Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, p. 55, 4th ed. This is exactly what Luke seems to have thought when seeking information directly from those who knew the facts concerning which he intended to write.

from the very beginning (ἄνωθεν) in order that Theophilus "might fully know the *certainty* [την ασφάλειαν] of those things" (λόγων) in which he had been "orally instructed" (κατηχήθης).[1] But he could not have traced everything from the beginning had he omitted inquiry into such an event as the birth of the Christ whose life he was about to write. The narrative of that birth, therefore, as given by Luke must be included also among the *accurately ascertained* historical facts. He is not recording myths founded on Old Testament stories of miraculous births, nor Judaized adaptations of Babylonian legends which were utterly foreign to the thought of that day in the circle of Hebraism and repulsive alike to both Christian and Jew, but the facts; facts which were fully established by the testimony of those who had personal knowledge of the facts. Luke seems to have personal acquaintance with many of the women who were friends and companions of the mother of Jesus, and we know that Mary, the mother, was among the company of the apostles and disciples of the Lord who sojourned in Jerusalem after his ascension waiting for "the promise of the Father."

But notwithstanding, and in opposition to, these careful statements of Luke, Lobstein affirms, "Our research into the genesis of the myth of the Nativity, has proved to us that the conception of the miraculous birth of Christ is the fruit of religious feeling, the echo

[1] A l'origine, l'enseignement de l'Eglise était purement oral. Nous devons admettre que dans les communautés Chrétiennes on suivait les usages de la Synagogue, et qu'ils y donnaient des instructions religieuses régulières.—Menegoz, *La Théologie de L'Epître aux Hebreux*, p. 177.

of Christian experience, the poetic and popular expression of an affirmation of faith." The evangelist Luke, however, lived a little closer to the time when the event occurred than does Lobstein, and his researches, according to his statement, did not result in such conclusions. Modern research has established beyond question, even in the matter of the taxing under Quirinius, so long disputed, the credibility of Luke as an historian. He had every means for ascertaining the exact truth, being contemporary and in fellowship with those who were eyewitnesses of the marvelous Life whose history he writes, and his statements, therefore, at the bar of reason seem to be more worthy of credence than the fanciful conclusions of latter-day critics. As ascertained facts they are more worthy of belief even than many of the accepted historical statements which have come down to us unquestioned concerning many well-known characters and also events. As a matter of fact, and to adopt the skeptical attitude and methods of destructive critics, let me ask what unimpeachable evidence is there, for example, that Julius Cæsar was assassinated in the senate, and fell at the foot of Pompey's statue, "which all the while ran blood"? The only evidence we have, strange as it may seem, is contained in the histories of Plutarch, Lucian, Suetonius, and Appian. But not one of these writers ever witnessed the fact, nor did he ever see an eyewitness, nor a contemporary of the tragic deed. Not one of these writers was even born at that time. Lucian was born eighty years after the event; Plutarch ninety years; Suetonius one hundred and fourteen years; and Appian one hundred and forty years. And

yet their statements are accepted as without doubt historic truth, while the declarations of the historian Luke, who knew as well as modern critics know the astounding character of the facts he recites, are set aside as the result of Oriental influence on the poetic imaginations of Jewish Christians.

In order to break the force of the foregoing and to forestall the conclusions which must inevitably follow, attempt is made to show that chapter 1. 34, 35, was not written by the evangelist, but is a later addition.

There are two theories,[1] it is affirmed, in the gospels of the origin of Christ's divine Sonship, each canceling the other. One is that Christ was the natural born son of Joseph and Mary, who received at his baptism the Holy Spirit in great power and became by that spiritual adoption the Son of God. This is the teaching of Mark, who knows nothing of an angelic visitation nor of a supernatural birth, and also of the original Luke, the gospel of John and the epistles of Paul. The evidence for this is that in Mark the Sonship of Christ begins with his baptism, and that, as Lobstein says, the fears of Mary the mother, as recorded in 3. 21, "would be absolutely inconceivable were it true that Mary was piously treasuring as a family tradition the lively remembrance of the scenes of the Annunciation and the Nativity." In Luke, Joseph and Mary are referred to as "his parents," 2. 27, 33, 41, 48, and 11. 50, which, Usener affirms, "convincingly proves that in the mind of the narrator Joseph and Mary were, and knew themselves to be, in the natural sense of the word, the parents of Jesus."

[1] *The Christian Quarterly Review*, July, 1904.

The second theory is that the story of the Annunciation and the supernatural birth in Matthew and Luke is interpolated. In Matthew the genealogy shows that the earlier tradition was the one held, and that here, as in Luke, the interpolated material is utterly irreconcilable with this earlier teaching. If this later narrative is removed the irreconcilable character of these first chapters in these gospels will also be eliminated, and a consistent narrative, involving no miracle or glaring inconsistencies such as are now seen plainly on the face of these chapters, will be found underlying the superimposed idea of a virgin birth.

Such is the theory of some recent critics. The question, then, is, Is it correct? Of course, if passages in Scripture teaching any particular doctrine are arbitrarily removed, it may be easily inferred or proved that a contrary doctrine was the original teaching; but such a thoroughly unscientific method will hardly commend itself to genuine criticism.

For the hypothesis that Luke i. 34, 35, or any part of the birth narrative in Luke, is an interpolation, textual criticism affords no support.[1] No time can

[1] 1. The Lower Criticism confirms the dogma of the virgin birth. That doctrine is contained in the gospels of Matthew (i, 18-25) and Luke (i, 26-39). These passages are now and always have been in the texts of these gospels, and there are no variations in codices or translations that in any particular impair their statements as to the virgin birth.

2. The Higher Criticism also confirms the dogma. It is true that the dogma is not contained in the gospel of Mark; but that gospel begins the story of Jesus with his baptism and only briefly reports the ministry of John the Baptist prior to it. The author of this gospel, however, represents Jesus as the Son of God, the Lord God of Isaiah 40. 3, heralded by John, the messenger of that prophecy. It did not come within the scope of the plan of this evangelist to state how the divine Son of God entered the world.—Professor Charles A. Briggs, *North American Review*, June, 1906.

be fixed when such an interpolation could have been invented or inserted. Did the record give birth to the myth, or the myth to the record? The myth could not have occasioned the record, for that was made and in the possession of the Church before it was possible for such a myth concerning such a personality as Jesus to have been constructed, or to have gained such circulation and credence that its record should be considered necessary or desirable. Moreover, if the non-supernatural—the natural birth of Jesus had been the original belief of the Christian communities, if it had been among those teachings of the faith in which Theophilus had been orally instructed, the conflict between the two forms of belief must have manifested itself in the Christian community and in New Testament writings in various ways for some time; but there is not a trace of any conflict in the Church of Paul's day on this subject, though many other questions pertaining to Christ seem to have called for Apostolic comment. It cannot be assumed, as do Soltau and Usener and others of that school, that Paul knew nothing of a supernatural birth, or if he did know of Luke's gospel, which is denied, that the birth narrative had not yet been inserted in that gospel. Nor is there any sufficient evidence that the gospel by Luke was interpolated at a later date—that is, after the martyrdom of Paul, A. D. 68—or that there was any conflict in the Church concerning the supernatural birth of our Lord, although some heretics had already begun to philosophize on the manifestations of the Logos. Not till the appearance of Marcion in Rome, A. D. 140, is there any attempt to reconstruct the text

of Luke. The date of Luke's gospel is placed at A. D. 63, A. D. 80, and A. D. 100. Among those who contend for the later dates are Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Schwegler, Weizsächer, and Volkmar. Among those who advocate the early date, A. D. 63, are Alford, Godet, Hitzig, Wieseler, Hofman, Ebrard, Gloag, and Tholuck. But it makes very little difference, just now, which date is accepted. The point is this: Marcion, who, like Cerinthus, denied the human birth of Christ and mutilated the text of Luke by eliminating from it every passage that did not support his theory, taught in Rome about the year 140 A. D. From the independent testimony of Tertullian and Epiphanius we know that Marcion did omit from his copy of Luke's gospel those chapters which record the birth of Jesus. Textual criticism has patiently and thoroughly probed into this subject with the result that, as stated by Professor A. Plummer, "It is now conceded on all sides that Marcion's gospel does not represent the original Luke, and that our third gospel has not been largely augmented and interpolated, especially by the addition of the first three chapters and the last seven verses."

It is evident that Marcion could not have omitted from Luke's gospel what was not in that gospel. But he did exscind the first three chapters, and therefore those chapters were in Luke's gospel in the days of Marcion's teaching in Rome, A. D. 140. What time was there, then, between the supposed date of Luke's gospel, 100 A. D., and Marcion, 140 A. D., for the origin and development of what Lobstein designates as this "dogma or myth inspired by religious faith

created by popular imagination"? this work of "poetical and religious creation prompted by faith"? Myths require time. They are not born in the morning and universally accepted before sundown.

That Luke made use of documents in the composition of his narrative, and that these Aramaic originals dated back many years prior to the date of his gospel, there can be perhaps but little doubt. This is the opinion of such scholars as Sanday, Weiss, Godet, and many other New Testament critics.[1] Weiss declares that the Hebraistic diction of these documents presents such a striking contrast to the classical Greek of the preface that the use of a written source can hardly be denied. Even Gunkel is of the opinion that they are a translation of a Hebrew original, which he refers to as "a genuine document of a very primitive Jewish-Christian type." Godet observes that in the use of these early documents Luke faithfully preserved their Aramaic coloring. These sources, then, do not belong to the close of the first century. Their concept of the Messiah of Israel, their mental standpoint and forms of expressions are such as no Christian looking on the life and personality of Jesus and believing in him as God Incarnate, the Redeemer of the race, could have invented. They belong to a time when the Messianic hope from a Hebraic standpoint had received a fresh impulse,[2] and the rejection of the Messiah,

[1] See Sanday in *Critical Questions*, pp. 130, 136.

[2] Even Dr. Briggs will admit that these narratives are of a date prior to the Fall of Jerusalem. "They must have originated in the Palestinian community before the dispersion of the Christians prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, thus during the lifetime of James and Jude, the half-brothers of Christ, and on that account credible to as high a degree as any other document of the New Testament."—C. A. Briggs, *North American Review*, June, 1906.

from a Christian standpoint, by the whole Jewish nation had not yet become an accomplished fact. These early documents, these written sources of Luke belong to the birth time of Christ. The holy reserve, the fine femininity, the tender touches, the impression derived from the whole suggests a woman's hand as their author. They record the personal experiences of the virgin mother, who, with Joseph, must have been the original source, for no one else could have known the facts but Joseph and Mary who experienced the facts. Such narratives could not have been the fabrication of any believer in Christ, since it is not conceivable that any follower of the Christ would for poetic, idealistic, reasons, exalt the personality of his Redeemer at the expense of the moral character of his parents.

And here is the impregnable rock against which rationalistic criticism dashes itself in vain. The self-same gospels which declare the Christ to be known by the people of Nazareth and other places only as the "son of Joseph," "the carpenter's son," declare him at the same time to be the Son of God, and that he was born of a woman who was as yet only betrothed to her future husband.

The idea that a redactor of later date inserted the narrative of the supernatural birth in Luke's gospel and yet overlooked all the old references to Joseph as the father of Jesus or permitted them to remain (2. 27, 33, 41, 43, 48) is incredible. Interpolations are not made that way. The fact that the seemingly inconsistent, contradictory and mutually exclusive statements expressing human parentage and a super-

natural birth lie side by side in these gospels is evidence that these narratives belong to the very earliest period, the apostolic period, and that they truthfully state the historic facts. During the lifetime of Jesus he could not have been spoken of other than as the son of Joseph. Nor could the compilers of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke have given him a different pedigree. He must, to human thought, have been the son of some one and recorded as such. Whose son, then, was he? He could not have been spoken of other than as Joseph's son unless from the very beginning everyone perceived him to be, believed him to be, the Son of God. When he was born Joseph was the betrothed of his mother, and it was in Joseph's home, in Joseph's family, that he was nurtured from infancy, and to the knowledge of all in Nazareth it was for him that Joseph and Mary, "his parents," toiled as did other fathers and mothers in the little village for their children. The gospels, then, are true to the facts of life, to what must have been the facts, when they record the sayings of the contemporaries of Jesus, or when for very natural reasons they quote or adopt these common sayings, as did Joseph and Mary themselves in ordinary conversation—which both, naturally and wisely, did for prudential reasons known only to the shrinking, sensitive hearts of the two who kept the holy secret which no one then could have believed, and the knowledge of which would have brought only trouble and misfortune to the lowly, defenseless family.

All this shows conclusively that these narratives could not have been invented at a late period, nor

even in the days of Paul and of John, when the doctrines of the divine Sonship of Christ, the eternal Logos existing in the bosom of God, his creative power making and ruling all worlds, was a dominant note in apostolic proclamations and catechetical instruction. Otherwise all references to Joseph as the father of Jesus would most certainly have been eliminated from the original text, as Marcion attempted to do, and we would have known nothing of Joseph at all, with the result that the naturalness of the situation and the historic truthfulness of the whole would have been mangled and destroyed.

The statement of Professor Lobstein,[1] that the fears of Mary for her son are "absolutely inconceivable if it were true that Mary was piously treasuring as a family tradition the lively remembrance of the scenes of the Annunciation and of the Nativity," proceeds on the unphilosophical assumption that during his early years and prior to his resurrection Mary always knew that the child of her bosom was the incarnate God—that she knew always what could only have been known in later years and what we know now. This is not at all true to life. It is philosophically and historically improbable. That Mary had doubts and serious questionings which she could not answer is so natural that to our thought, and certainly to the rationalism of our day, she herself would lose the character of the true mother she was and take on the character of a myth, if she did not have them. This mysterious being—her own flesh and blood, and yet more than hers—must have been a profound mystery

[1] *Virgin Birth*, p. 51.

to her as he was to his disciples, and as he is today no less to the earnest seeker after truth than to the adoring saint. Is, then, the mental attitude of Mary the mother so surprising? Would not such a being always excite her wonder, even a deeper wonder and of another quality than that of the multitude who gazed in blank amazement at his marvelous works? She does know he is more than human, but whence her knowledge of that? At the Cana marriage feast she appeals to his power and cautions the servants to obey him. Whence her knowledge of his superhuman power? If the mighty mother-love, that divine human instinct in woman to which God himself often refers, crowds out all else in mind and soul for the moment when the holy being born of her and nurtured by her is in danger, it is not rational to turn this sudden blaze of tenderness-alarmed into a subtle argument proving her ignorance of angel-visits and the overshadowing power of the Highest. The mother-heart never reasons; it loves, and such love is ever a reason to itself.

No difficulty has yet arisen or been invented by the deniers of the virgin birth of Christ which appears more incredible than those bare statements which, in full view of all that the multitude supposed, and in full view of all apparent incredibility, Luke himself, after careful investigation, recorded as having been *fully established.*

The evangelists knew what they wrote. The theory[1] that the evangelist, or some Jewish-Christian redactor of later date, applied to the birth of Christ the mythical stories which were woven about the birth of the Em-

[1] Soltau, *Geburtgeschichte.*

peror Augustus, in whose reign Christ was born, and that the similarity of language used in describing the two births is evidence of the fact, is wholly untenable when it is considered that the legends of the birth of Augustus were current throughout the empire, and that therefore any attempt to fabricate a myth of the Christ birth would most certainly have been laughed at by a people hostile to the new religion as a clumsy imitation. No writer having regard for truth would have attempted the daring feat, and certainly no Christian would have accepted as an historical fact the improvised story. Moreover, the apostolic age was an incredulous age.[1] Lecky[2] tells us that "the philosophers were always either contemptuous of or hostile to the prevailing legends," that "in the Roman Republic and Empire a general skepticism had likewise arisen among the philosophers as the first fruit of intellectual development, and the educated classes were speedily divided between avowed or virtual atheists, like the Epicureans, and pure theists like the Stoics and the Platonists." He quotes Juvenal to the effect that the very children and old women ridiculed Cerberus and the Furies, or treated them as mere metaphors of conscience. Roman wits made divination the favorite subject of their ridicule, and, with an irony not unlike that of Isaiah, Horace described the carpenter deliberating whether he would convert a shapeless log into a bench or into a god.

The apostolic age was not one of the ages of faith.

[1] Bunsen, writing to Dr. Arnold, exclaims, "The idea of men writing mythic histories between the time of Livy and Tacitus, and St. Paul mistaking such for realities!"—*Life of Arnold,* vol. ii, p. 58.

[2] *History of European Morals,* vol. i, pp. 161-165.

Superstition lingered, but the crumbling away of ancient belief in the gods, in the oracles, in divination, and in the time-worn legends made it all the more difficult to foist upon general atheism old fables with new applications as historic facts or truths of God. The origin and development of such a myth in that age was impossible. "The very resemblance," says Professor Ramsay,[1] referring to the resemblance between the language used about the birth of the Emperor Augustus and the language used about the birth of Christ—"The very resemblance, so startling, apparently, to those who are suddenly confronted with a good example of it . . . is the best and entirely sufficient proof that the idea and the narrative of the birth of Christ could not be a growth of mythology at a later time, even during the period about A. D. 60-100, but sprang from the conditions and thoughts and expressed itself in the words of the period to which it professes to belong." And this fact, he goes on to say, "assigns correctly the period when the Christian narrative originated . . . it cuts away the ground beneath the feet of those who have maintained that the gospels are the culmination of a long growth of mythology about a more or less historical Jesus."

The assured result of examination of this theory of Professor Lobstein, then, is, first, that the narratives of Matthew and Luke concerning the birth of Christ are not the inventions of Christ's enemies; second, they are not the inventions of Christ's disciples during his lifetime and certainly not after his ascension, since the apostolic conception of the Christ is wholly different

[1] *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 54.

from that of the Aramaic sources which Luke used in the composition of his gospel. Notwithstanding all finely-spun theories concerning the origin and growth of myths, and the influence of heathen religions and of Hellenistic or Alexandrian philosophy on the religious thought of Israel, a critical study of the questions involved compels an ever-deepening conviction that the evangelists recorded historic truth, however marvelous the facts may have appeared to them or to others. As Professor Chase observes,[1] "I know that there are many surprises in the history of religion. But I confess I find it hard to believe that in the inner circle of the earliest disciples—that is to say, at Jerusalem, and within fifty years of the Passion—there grew up and took shape, not poetical and idealized adjuncts to the study of the Lord's birth, but a story itself wholly fictitious."

The apocryphal gospels of Thomas or Matthew, the History of Joseph, the Gospel of the Infancy, the Proto-evangelism of James, have no place in this connection. They are all of the succeeding centuries and were never accepted by the Church. We know their origin. They rest upon the facts of the canonical gospels and without these gospels they would not have been; but, while nothing could have prevented lively imaginations from building pious fictions, silly as they are, the common sense of the Church did enable it to distinguish between fact and fancy and to separate the chaff from the wheat.[2]

[1] *The Supernatural Element in our Lord's Life.*—Macmillan.

[2] Before I undertook this work I never realized, so completely as I do now, the impassable gulf which separates the genuine gospels from these.—B. Harris Cowper, Preface to trans. of *The Apocryphal Gospels.*

CHAPTER IV

The Virgin Birth and Heathen Parallels

The religion of Christ never won its victories with the aid of fraud, nor do men deliberately pluck the purple flowers of martyrdom for the sake of a dream of their own devising. Professor Cheyne, of Oxford, thinks otherwise. Lobstein, asserting that this "myth" of the virgin birth had its roots deep down in the religion of Israel, concludes that "it is therefore unnecessary to resort to the hypothesis of pagan influence, or of Hellenic or Oriental factors, in order to explain the origin of the belief in the supernatural birth of Christ." Professor Cheyne, however, would go farther afield. "Let me say at once," he writes, "that the historical explanation of the statement of the virgin birth of Christ which seems to me to be the most probable is that it originated, not in a mistranslation of the Immanuel-prophecy (Isa. 7. 14), which is Professor Harnack's theory, nor, immediately, in a non-Jewish, heathen story, adopted by Gentile Christians, but in a story of non-Jewish origin current in Jewish circles, and borrowed from them by certain Jewish Christians." He then proceeds to cite parallels to the birth of Christ, from Arabian, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Persian mythologies, which probably influenced Jewish thought and which were borrowed from the Jews by the Jewish Christians. He finds that almost every signal event in the life of Christ has its counterpart in the legends of the gods: his birth, his baptism,

the descent of the Holy Spirit, his death, number of days he was in the grave, his resurrection, and even his designation as the "only begotten God" (John 1. 18). The title of his mother as "the virgin" belongs to the time when the mystic mother-goddess, like the Egyptian goddess Isis, was independent of the marriage tie, when "the mother held the chief place in the clan and all women shared a measure of free love." "The mother of Dusares was the old mother-goddess and the title 'virgin' applied to her suggests the true meaning of the term in that non-Jewish story which was most probably adopted by Jews and Jewish Christians as they thought best." It is therefore no surprise that Cheyne declares that the birth narratives of the first and third gospels "are not history in the modern sense of the word, but a substitute for history addressed to the pious imagination." Professor Otto Pfleiderer also endeavors to make much of the parallels to the virgin birth of our Lord which are to be found in pagan stories and also of the New Testament declarations of Christ's preëxistence, to which corresponds, he thinks, the legend of Buddha, who in the assembly of the gods taught the "law," and declared to them his purpose to descend to earth and be born of a woman that he may redeem the world. The Temptation in the Wilderness is also paralleled by this same Buddha legend and by the Persian story of Zarathrustra, another manifestation of the divine; and as for the miracles of our Lord—miracles of knowledge, including insight, foreknowledge, knowledge of the past, of the present, and of events at a distance; miracles of power, such as casting out demons, cure of

diseases, raising of the dead, power over the forces of nature, freedom from the limitations of space, and material conditions—"all these miracles," affirms Pfleiderer, "find countless parallels in the legends of pagan heroes and Christian saints." And his explanation of these parallels is that Christianity is a development of the earlier religions as "their higher unity and purer truth." "Primitive Christianity," he explains, "has transformed the Jesus of history into the Christ of faith, in that it has, after the manner of ancient animism, objectified the impression which it received of his life and death into a self-existing Christ-Spirit, and has then in thought identified this spirit with the heavenly Son of man of the Apocalypse and the Son of God and Logos of Gnosis, and has finally brought this eternal heavenly being down to earth to become man, to die, to return to heaven, there to share the throne and sovereignty of God until his future coming to judge the world. In this divinely human drama of redemption the Christian faith attained to a form of expression which, the closer its formal connection with heathen myths, was only the more fitted for the conquest of heathenism."[1] Such are the extremes to which some critics go when, having taken leave of historic judgment, they forget the face of truth and find comfort in what the apostles of Christ denounced as "cunningly devised myths" and "old wives' fables."

It is no new discovery, dependent for its revelation on the illuminating genius of modern research, that the Babylonians, Persians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, and indeed all nations of antiquity, recited

[1] *The Early Christian Conception of Christ*, p. 160.

legends of their gods and of the supernatural birth of their heroes. That these stories, however, influenced Jewish thought in any degree or formed any basis whatever for the Christian narrative of Christ's birth there is no evidence of any kind from any source. It is a bare, bold, unsustained assertion which anyone who would play lightly with historic facts might make without any serious draft on his critical ability. The Babylonian and other legends which Professors Lobstein, Cheyne, and Pfleiderer cite, and which in one form or another became the common property of all primitive peoples, date back thousands of years before Christ. But in his day they were no longer subjects of universal knowledge or of belief in their original form and as we now study them, although they were probably not wholly forgotten in the distracting confusion of jostling gods and foreign modes of worship. But they were vanishing memories. In the East perhaps not one worshiper among thousands, bowing low to the self-complacent gods of Egypt or to the baked clay gods of Babylonia, ever heard of Marduk or of Dusares. The old gods of the Euphrates valley were dead. Their legends were buried beneath the ruins of the temples erected to them in a remote and shadowy past, or, if yet dimly seen on broken tablet or crumbling palace wall, there were but few among the many who could decipher the strange inscription which concealed the ancient story. The gods of Olympus and the mightier gods of the Roman Capitol and the Forum had long since displaced in popular imagination the misty deities of Chaldea. In the Roman province of Asia which, says Professor Ramsay, in-

cluded the most civilized and educated regions of the Asiatic Continent, the native languages had died out in nearly all the principal districts. Here and there in the rural portions the ancient tongue and the ancient rites were preserved, "but the great cities of the province Asia [as distinguished from the rural parts], except a few of the most backward Phrygian towns, were pretty thoroughly Greek in the first century after Christ; and everywhere throughout the province all education was Greek, and there was probably no writing except in Greek."[1] The world was growing weary of hoary antiquity. A mysterious power was working in human history, a new dawn was breaking, and everywhere the gods, the faiths, and the legends of the ages were beginning to fade like the stars of the morning before the coming light of a larger day. To invent, then, a theory that the disciples of Christ, or poetizing followers of him in the apostolic age, or at any time in the sub-apostolic period, were influenced by these legends and adapted them to the simple story of his birth, and the supposition that all great men must have a mysterious origin, and that, thus knowingly weaving a garment of falsehood about the infant Jesus, they expected men to believe such worn-out fables, fables which were openly ridiculed and laughed at by the poets and philosophers of their day—is to deliberately abandon the straightforward paths of history for the uncertain flights of unbridled fancy.

It is history, and not myth, that to the Jews the heathen deities were not entities but lying vanities. Jealous for the glory of Jehovah, the licentious wor-

[1] *The Seven Letters*, etc., pp. 120, 121.

ship, the legends, and obscene mythologies of the heathen were an abomination to Jewish thought and feeling. Hateful, then, and contemptuous as was the mental and moral attitude of the Jews in the days of Christ toward the whole tribe of libidinous gods and goddesses of the nations whom they despised, how much more repugnant must have been these fables to those Jewish Christians who constituted the Church in apostolic days! The Christ was too near, the sense of his divine presence, the power of his personality, the conviction of him as the Holy One, the Way, the Truth, the Life, the Saviour from sin, was too keen, too vivid, in the Christian consciousness, for any such psychological miracle ever to have occurred. When the apostle Peter declared to the Dispersion throughout the Empire, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables," he voiced the conviction of the entire Church, and this declaration not only affirmed the belief of the Church in the historicity of the facts predicated of the Christ, but also knowledge and condemnation of the cunningly devised fables (myths) of the heathen world.

It is no new discovery, but a fact well known to many generations of scholars, that a similarity does exist between the gospel narrative of our Lord's birth and the birth-legends of heathen deities and heroes. The impulse of extreme rationalists who maintain a wholly naturalistic view of Christ's person is to assert that these analogies can in no way be accounted for except on the ground that these narratives are adaptations or transformations of those legends to the requirements of the case. "Let me hasten to add," says

Professor Cheyne, "that, though the prelude to the first gospel does appear to contain mythic elements, it is equally clear that the Christians, even more than their Jewish predecessors, treated the borrowed material very freely, in the spirit of those words of Saint Paul, 'all things are yours.' "[1]

The value of Professor Cheyne's critical researches in this direction may be estimated when he seriously suggests, for example, that the woman arrayed with the sun in Rev. 2 became to the writer in the Matthæan prelude a lowly Jewish maiden; that the dragon became Herod; and the flight of the mother into the wilderness—all being in origin heathen myths—became the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt! It is evident that a severe economy of the critical judgment must be exercised by one who would adopt such vagaries. Analogies do not prove kinship; that is, that because two things are similar therefore one must have originated in or is in any way dependent for its existence upon the other. "Before all things," says Professor Pfleiderer, "we must guard against the constant practice of imagining that the inward affinity of religious conceptions implies a connection in their external history. . . . The assumption of historical connection, whether direct or indirect, is only admissible with some probability in such cases when the similarity consists not simply in some common conception or some chance coincidence in expression, but extends to distinct successions of details." But just here, and parenthetically, with reference to the "successions of details" to which Professor Pfleiderer refers, and

[1] *Bible Problems*, p. 89.

which to many are so startling, it should be emphatically stated that no such "successions of details" exist in the supposed parallels between the recorded events in the life of our divine Lord and the legends of mythology. Nor, in fact, does any real similarity exist between any event in the life of Christ and the birth, deeds or death of any hero of Babylonian, Iranian, Greek, or Egyptian myth. The fundamental ideas distinguishing the heathen from the Christian story do not belong at all to the same world. It is only by reading into these supposed parallels meanings familiar to the Christian mind, and designating them by terms and phrases having Christian significance or some moral association, that, by the verbal jugglery of rationalistic critics, they are at all made to appear "parallel" to the birth and deeds of our Lord. But surely such exegesis is not admissible.

It is also important that in this place something should be said concerning the very remarkable coincidences which are exploited as existing between Christ and Buddha. And in this particular I can do no better than to give *in extenso* the following correspondence between Dr. John Henry Newman and Professor Rhys Davids, than whom, as head of the students of Pali literature, no living man was more competent to express an opinion. In the *Nineteenth Century* of December, 1880, Dr. J. Estlin Carpenter had discussed in a learned article the whole subject of the relations between Buddhism and Christianity. The article attracted the attention of Cardinal—then Doctor—Newman, and in a letter to a friend, Mr. W. S. Lilly—from whose work, *The Claims of Christianity,* the follow-

ing correspondence, the value of which will justify its length, is taken—he writes:

Now what is the coincidence which I think so startling? Not the mere claim to a supernatural sanction. A divine birth, a gift of miracles, an heroic life, a great success, are the claims historically of every great moral teacher and social reformer. Nor, again, is there a difficulty in a close resemblance in the accounts left us of the ethical code promulgated by our Lord and Buddha. There is little in the ethics of Christianity which the human mind may not reach by its natural powers, and which here and there, in the instance of individuals, great poets, and great philosophers, has not in fact been anticipated. It is not this which I want explained, but it is the series of details wrought into the life of Buddha, so parallel to that which we find in the gospels, it is this which leads me to ask for the authority on which it is reported to me, and on first hearing to meet it with deep suspicion of its untrustworthiness, and to ask whether it is not posterior to Christianity and referable to Christian teaching.

For instance, I am told that Buddha came on earth with the object of "redeeming the world"; that he "voluntarily descended from his high estate"; that his descent was the last of a series of "incarnations" with the one object, from first to last, of delivering mankind "from sin and sorrow"; that he became incarnate in a married woman; that he was born when his mother was journeying to her paternal home; that, on its taking place, the gods in the heavens sang, "This day a son is born" to "give joy and peace to men, to shed light in the dark places," and to "give sight to the blind." When the child was presented to his father an aged saint wept as he predicted his future greatness, saying, "What happiness shall ensue from the birth of this

child? My time of departure is close at hand." He had the name of the "Establisher"; "He grew in wisdom and stature; he taught his teachers." The Tempter appeared and promised him universal sovereignty; but he replied, "I want not an earthly kingdom. Depart!" On his attaining Buddhahood there followed miracles: "the blind saw, the deaf heard, the lame walked, and the captives were restored to liberty," he himself was "transfigured," etc., etc.

Now, what is the authority, what the evidence, for all this?

Buddha came "to redeem the world" (we must keep to the very words, else there will be no difficulty to be solved). Then I ask, who told us this? The gospels were written, say ten, or twenty, suppose fifty or one hundred years after the events they record, and are separate witnesses for those events: is the Buddhist gospel as near the time of Buddha as the Christian to Christ? Who tells us that the gods sang on Buddha's birth and proclaimed peace to men? Who were the witnesses, or at least the reporters, of the fact of Buddha's fight with the Tempter? To prove the authenticity and the date of one of our gospels we are plunged into a maze of MSS. of various dates and families, of various and patristic testimonies and quotations, and to satisfy the severity of our critics there must be an absolute coincidence of text and concordance of statement in these various MSS. put forward as evidence. If a particular passage is not found in all discoverable MSS. it is condemned. There are MSS. of Saint John which omit the account of the Angel of Bethesda, as it stands in his fifth chapter; accordingly the exegetical lecturer thinks himself at liberty to disbelieve the narrative. The termination of Saint Mark is wanting in other MSS.; in consequence, as if this omission was an actual disproof of its authenticity, a critic expresses his gratification that we are no longer

bound by the text, "He that believeth not," etc. And in vain are the "three witnesses" found in the Latin text of Saint John's first epistle; it is fatal to their reception that they are not found in the Greek. Why are we not to ask for evidence parallel to this before we receive the history of Buddha? Perhaps you will answer, But he lived so long ago; how can you expect a contemporary life of one who lived in the days of Darius Hystaspes? True, but I remark that the mere absence of evidence is not itself evidence; may it not rather be urged, from the parallel of Roman history, that the absence of historical evidence is the sure forerunner and token of myths? 1759 2

There is nothing producible, as far as has been brought home to me, to show that the words and deeds and history attributed to Buddha form a whole, such as the gospels, and existed in detail for earlier than one thousand years after Buddha; nothing to show that the passages in the Buddhist books which are now received do not belong to Christian sources; nothing to show that the very best reason for thinking that they were in existence as early as seven or eight hundred years after Buddha is the fact that Christianity having spread through the East by that time, as the Aristotelian Saracens and Moors in the Middle Ages are a proof of their influence on the Catholic Schoolmen. There is more evidence that Christianity influenced the Buddhist traditions than that the history of Buddha, as now reported, existed as it now exists before the Christian era.

I write this as an empirical view, as a case which has to be investigated. I am quite unlearned in the subject, but I want to know whether my question can be satisfactorily answered. I do not of course deny the singular greatness of Buddha; it is the details of his history that I am sceptical about. Meanwhile, in order to prove that my belief in the influence of Chris-

tianity in the East in our first centuries is not unwarranted, I quote the following passage from Gibbon about the Nestorians.

He then quotes Gibbon, chapter 47.

To this letter Dr. Rhys Davids replies:

Many thanks for allowing me to read Dr. Newman's very interesting letter, which I return. I cannot believe that the Buddhist traditions had any influence at all over Christian belief. It is much more likely that the later Buddhist writers were influenced by Nestorian and other Christian missionaries. But of this too there is no evidence as yet. The resemblances between the two accounts are often very striking at first sight, but they are shown by the slightest examination to rest on a basis of belief quite contradictory. Thus, the Buddhists did not ascribe to Gotama any divine birth in the Christian sense. Before his descent into his mother's womb he was a deva; that is, one of the innnumerable spiritual beings who were supposed to people the Tusita heavens. When Buddhism arose the Hindoos believed in a Great First Cause, in whom and by whom all things exist. The Buddhists established no connection between their master and this being.

So again the miracles. The oldest research in the Pali Suttas do not ascribe to the Buddha any such actions as are designated in Christian writings by the word "miracle." In a similar way all that exact identity of phraseology which is necessary to support the hypothesis of a borrowing either from one side or the other seems to me to fade quite away when the supposed resemblances between Christian and Buddhist accounts are examined. "Buddha came on earth to redeem the world." Well, I can quite imagine a Christian writer so describing the Buddhist belief. But, though the description is fair enough, the *expres-*

sion cannot be found, so far as I am aware, in any Pali Sutta. The expression used in the Nalaka Sutta, by the devas in their song of joy at the birth of the child, comes near to it, but it is not the same. They say "The Bodhisat, the excellent pearl, the incomparable, is born for a good and for a blessing in the world of men," etc. And it is only to the Pali Suttas that we can go for any evidence of Buddhist expressions actually used (before the Christian era) to describe events in Gotama's life. Asoka's edicts have not a word about the life of Buddha. The bas-reliefs at Barhut are certainly pre-Christian, but they give pictures, not words. And the Chinese and other accounts are all post-Christian. It is in these Chinese books (or rather in the English phraseology of our particular translator of them) that the supposed Christian phrases are usually found. I have the honor therefore to find myself in agreement with your revered correspondent as to the uncertainty of any conclusions that might be drawn from the coincidence in expression of these later Buddhists with the much older Christian writers.

And furthermore, with reference to the above caution of Pfleiderer it must be said that if there is a "successions of details," which there is not, even then historical interdependence does not always and necessarily follow. Chronology and geography must be considered; for while the succession and similarity of detail which is said to be clear, as we have seen, but is not, between the Buddhist legend of the infancy of Buddha and the gospel history of the infancy of Christ, the heavenly birth, the singing of the angels, the shining light, the prophecy of the old seer, and also the parallels which may be drawn between the Krishna legend and Matthew's account of the at-

tempts of Herod on the Christ-child, which recent criticism adduces—while all those perplexing details may seemingly exist, yet time and distance between the lands where the accounts are given may put "historical interdependence" absolutely out of all consideration.

Are we seriously expected to believe that, because there are striking resemblances between the myths of all nations and the gospel statements of Christ's birth and events in his life, therefore these statements are not true, these events never occurred, but were adaptations of ethnic myths? That because, according to Hindoo legends, Krishna and Buddha, and among the Siamese Codom, and among the Chinese Fo-hi, Lao-Kiun, and Confucius, and among the Mexicans Quetzalcoatl, were all virgin born, therefore the virgin birth of Christ is also a myth? And what a long roll of the virgin born have we among the old Greeks and Romans: Perseus, Amphion, Bacchus, Hercules, Mercury, whose mother's name was Maia, as Buddha's in India was Maya; Arcus, Eolus, Apollo—who, like Buddha and the Chinese Lao-Kiun, was born under a tree; Romulus, Augustus Cæsar, Alexander the Great, Plato, Apollonius, Pythagoras, and Aesculapius—son of a god and of a mortal mother, Coronis. Are we to believe that because Krishna at his birth was placed in a sheepfold, because Adonis, Phœbus, Apollo, Bacchus, Attys, and Mithras the Persian redeemer, were all born in a cave, therefore Christ was not born in a stable in Bethlehem? Because the Egyptian virgin born gods, Osiris, who gave his life for others, and Horus, who was killed in his conflict

with evil forces, were worshiped in Egyptian mysteries, and because Prometheus was nailed with arms extended, as one crucified, on Mount Caucasus near the Caspian Sea, does it follow that the crucifixion of Christ is mythological also? Osiris, Horus, Attys, Mithras, Bacchus, Hercules, Adonis, the Scandinavian god Baldur and the Mexican god Quetzalcoatl all rose from the dead, and this we suppose is a demontration that Christ did not rise. But according to this supremely logical reasoning it is very clear, and certain beyond all cavil as one of the best established results of critical research, that the history of the Civil War in the United States is also nothing more than a solar myth. It is a poetic conception, a struggle between darkness and light, between the destructive forces of the cold North seeking to destroy the warmth and verdure of the sunny South. The sun and stars fought, since we see the combatants carried starry flags in one of which the red bars typified the slanting rays of the sun. The war it is said lasted four years, thus signifying the four seasons; and the great leader of the Northern host which conquered the South, since at last all nature is destroyed by the death-enveloping, the all-destroying powers, was known as "Grant, the Hammer of God"; a title which reminds us at once of Thor, who was also the "Hammer of the gods." We are thus led back at once to a Scandinavian origin as the source of this interesting legend of the Civil War in the United States. Further study of this mythical conflict between the North and the South, concerning which, although hundreds of histories have come down to us, no two agree in scarcely any particular,

will repay the diligent student of Comparative Religion!

From the foregoing it is evident, we repeat, that analogy will not suffice to account for the facts with which we are dealing. There is no evidence that the gospel story of the birth had its beginning, as Professor Cheyne suggests, in Babylonian or other legend. The legends of the birth of Buddha and of Krishna bear a much closer analogy in every particular to the birth history of Christ than do any of the legends which Professor Cheyne selects and enlarges upon. If, then, close resemblance suggests source, the Buddha legend must have been the origin of Matthew and Luke's narrative rather than any of the Babylonian, South Arabian, or Iranian stories. But if, for geographical, ethnic, or other reasons, the Buddha myth is eliminated still the question presents itself, What shall we do with it? Whence did *it* spring and to what legends did *it* give rise?

Then, again, is it not more probable, on the close analogy theory, that the gospel story had its birth in Egyptian mythology rather than in Babylonian legend? Professor Sayce[1] quotes from a papyrus in Saint Petersburg a prophecy of an Egyptian messiah and he furnishes evidence that belief in a virgin birth of a Pharaoh reaches back to the eighteenth dynasty. The mother of Amenhotep III was a virgin when the god of Thebes presented himself to her and said, "Amenhotep is the name of the son who is in thy womb. He shall grow up according to the words that proceed out of thy mouth. He shall exercise sover-

[1] *The Religions of Egypt and Babylonia.*

eignty and righteousness in this land unto the very end. My soul is in him [and] he shall wear the two-fold crown of royalty, ruling the two worlds like the sun forever."

There is here, it will be seen, a striking resemblance to the Annunciation in the gospels. It is without parallel among the legends of Babylonia. Why not imagine that the gospel story was based on this myth from the remote ages of Egypt, if analogy, as Professor Cheyne endeavors to prove, suggests origin? The theory of Professor Cheyne does not appear to be supported by the facts. All that he does, and the same has been often done before, is to show that these birth stories of gods and heroes similar to the birth narrative of our Lord were common to all heathenism and that these myths date back to prehistoric times. But there is not the slightest evidence in support of the theory, but much to the contrary, that these legends, especially after the exile, were ever more than a theme of contemptuous ridicule among the Jews. How did it happen, and upon what theory thinkable can it be accounted for, if Jews or Jewish Christians were influenced by these hoary legends of the dawn, these glorifications of mythical heroes, that in all the long sweep of the ages of Israelitish history—a history made glorious by illustrious names in war and peace, in song, in statesmanship, and in religion—the Jews never once declared that any of their judges, or kings, generals, priests, or prophets, though they held converse with the Unseen and the Eternal, were God-born, till Jesus Christ came—and that too at a time when the virgin birth of the Messiah was not a sub-

ject of universal belief? How did this happen? The seemingly miraculous accounts of the birth of Samuel, Samson, and others, found in the Old Testament, do not meet the question; they are not in the same class. The Hebrews and Jewish Christians utterly abhorred the defilements of heathen mythology, and these facts render impossible the fanciful notions of Lobstein, Cheyne, Schmiedel, Gunkel, Pfleiderer, and others, who, undeterred by the failure of the Tübingen school to override common sense, would resuscitate the old mythical theories of Strauss with slight modification.

But for us at present another subject demands consideration. How can these ancient mythologies be accounted for, resembling as they do so closely the gospel narratives? If they originated in no historic fact why may not the story of Matthew and Luke also have been the product of poetry and the idealizing of an ordinary event? The genesis of ethnic myths, especially those of redeemers, deliverers, saviours, may well engage the careful study of earnest scholars. The easily-reached ready-made supposition that they have no historical basis, that they originated in the superstition natural to the child-period of all races, that all great men must have a supernatural origin, or, as Keim says,[1] "A human birth that towers above the ordinary level is never to be looked at as the fruit of mere human birth, but likewise as a deed of God in the world," will not go very far toward satisfying the critical judgment. The origin of a universal superstition which produces such similarity of myth among so many different races and nationalities must itself

[1] *History of Jesus of Nazareth,* vol. ii, p. 59.

be accounted for. It is like Harnack's theory that the idea of the virgin birth grew out of a mistranslation of Isa. 7. 14, a theory which settles nothing; for if the Seventy rendered *haalmah,* which it is insisted never means "virgin," by the Greek *parthenos,* which never means anything but "virgin," why did those Alexandrian Jews, with all their reverence for their Scriptures and their extensive knowledge of Greek and the sacred tongue, translate the Hebrew *haalmah*[1] by the Greek *parthenos?*

The mental characteristics, the spirit qualities, of the early Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Hindustan peoples, are radically different. This innate difference is clearly seen in the distinctly different characteristics outcropping in their literatures, architectures, religions, social lives—in all the outward manifestations of the race-spirit. The problem, then, is to account for a superstition that among such widely divergent peoples, overcoming all barriers of mind and race and place, could originate in the religion of each precisely the same idea of a redeemer, a saviour, and helper who shall be born of the gods. We cannot with any degree of confidence attribute such universality of belief to purposeless accident. One might just as well conclude that involved machinery in widely-separated lands, or houses or temples of exactly similar detail of architecture, were the accidental product of unrelated and fortuitous combinations as to imagine that this universal faith of mankind had an accidental origin. Universal reason protests against such illogical con-

[1] On Almah see Willis J. Beecher, *The Prophets and the Promise,* p. 334.

clusion. Nor can we agree with Pfleiderer, who, endeavoring to explain this problem, asserts that "from the same psychological causes, and with like social conditions, conceptions similar in character may arise in different places quite spontaneously and independently of one another." This is such a comprehensive explanation that it really explains nothing until we have a concrete case to which it may be applied. It certainly does not explain the problem before us. It assumes that the human mind is of such a nature that it will, without any basis of fact from which to start, evolve just such fanciful notions as the mythologies of the nations. But why does this same human mind confine itself to religion? Why does not the Oriental mind evolve the same things as the Western mind in art, in science, in commerce, industry, invention? Now, one or two related tribes may spontaneously evolve similar beliefs of the gods, of a deliverer, of a virgin birth, miracles, death, and resurrection of some supernatural hero, but Pfleiderer's explanation will never explain why unrelated tribes, why all races of men ethnologically distinct and separated from each other by seas and continents, should all develop exactly the same idea. It assumes what never was; that is, that there universally operated among widely-distributed peoples and nations just those identical "psychological causes" and "social conditions" which would produce these "conceptions" and no other! This indeed would be an inconceivable miracle—a miracle not simply unbelievable but really unthinkable—since it requires us to believe that there was not a single variation in any of these "psychological causes"

or "social conditions" among so many and so widely-distributed peoples in different environments; for whatever variation there is in the cause that variation will appear in the effect.

Artificial explanations solve no difficulty here. The theories of Pfleiderer and Cheyne do not correspond with the facts. The mind of the primitive races did not everywhere evolve the same cosmogony, which it ought to have done if, owing to the same "psychological causes" and "social conditions," it produced a theology and a soteriology, nor did it everywhere and out of itself give birth to the same idea of the gods.

There is in this universal belief in a Redeemer and Helper, notwithstanding the various forms it assumes among Babylonians, Egyptians, Chinese, Greek, and all others, such underlying unity, such common consciousness of helplessness, such uniform belief in the possibility of help, such expectancy of help—and of this help coming not from man but from the benevolent gods, not from the earth or the earthy and carnal but from heaven and the heavenly—that it becomes in a sense the grossest error to ascribe this extraordinary phenomenon to mere accident, to "psychological causes" or "social conditions," or to the fancy-weaving powers of an exuberant imagination. Whatever is universal in man is instinctive, is racial, and because it is thus imbedded in the warp and woof of human nature does it manifest itself in universal humanity.

To our thought there is only one solution to this question, which the more closely it is studied will the more satisfactorily fit into all the requirements of the case: that all these myths are but broken lights, cor-

rupted variations of dimly-remembered traditions of the primal promise of a Redeemer; the promise of the seed of the woman who should bruise the serpent's head. Cause comes before effect. Back of all these legends of a coming Redeemer there must have been one common ground from which they all sprang, and they may all be traced to the East, to those regions familiar to primitive man, the first habitat of humanity. Unconscious race prophecies, outward expressions of a conscious need nurtured by the rational idea, based on human helplessness, that saving power must come from above, these myths all point backward to one source: to a divine revelation of a hero, a redeemer, who will deliver man from the evil powers which war against him. That these legends had their beginnings in the East, in those regions watered by the Euphrates and the Tigris, and not in the West, is certainly what we should expect. Hence it is not surprising that Professor Hommel in his critical articles[1] should close the recording saying, "In conclusion I would once more note, with emphasis, that it is no fortuitous circumstance that it was not in Babylonia, for instance, with its cult of the sun (Bel-Samas) that these ancient anticipations of the Christ were current, but in Ur of the Chaldees, with its cult of the moon (Ea-Sin); Ur of the Chaldees, the home of Abraham, the friend of God." To this statement of Hommel we would add nor is it a "fortuitous circumstance" that to Abraham—a lineal descendant of Shem, a son of Noah, in whose family all the traditions of the world

[1] The Logos in the Chaldean Story of the Creation.—*Expository Times*, May, 1900, Dec., 1902.

before the flood were preserved; that to Abraham, in whose own immediate family these traditions were doubtless also preserved with more or less clearness and purity compared with the corruptions and adaptations of the same traditions by the Chaldees about them, from whom we have what is known as the Chaldean account of Genesis; that to Abraham, having knowledge of and treasuring the history of the past and the promise made to the fathers, which promise was kept alive in the very names by which they were known—considering all this, and much more which might be mentioned, it is not a fortuitous circumstance, nor is it in any way remarkable, but on the contrary in perfect harmony with the nature of things, that to Abraham should come the word of the Lord saying, "Get thee out of the country and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great and thou shalt be a blessing, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." In him in whom the Law of Selection begins, in him in whose family the sacred tradition, the promise of a Deliverer, the seed of the woman who should bruise the serpent's head, in him the ancient promise begins its fulfillment, was preserved, and it is in his seed at last, in the long run of the ages and in the fullness of time, that the promise is made good in the birth of Jesus Christ, our Lord and only Saviour, who was the son of David, who was the son of Abraham, who was the son of Seth, who was the son of Adam, who was the son of God.

The following note from the *Hibbert Journal,* July, 1905, confirms much in the foregoing and throws

much light on the constantly quoted legend of Krishna:

A complete solution may, I think, now be offered of the long-standing problem regarding the gospel narrative and the Krishna myth. Miss H. A. Dallas, who again raises the question in an acute form, asks if there are any means of tracing the date at which the Indian legend took shape, and gives three sources—the Mahabharata, the Bhagavad Gita, and the Puranas, rightly rejecting the Puranas as late, and, she might have added, worthless. She then leaves the whole question in the hands of "experts," and such an expert is certainly Mr. J. N. Farquhar, who shows (*East and West,* September, 1904) that the Mahabharata proper is also useless for the purpose, so that nothing remains except the Gita, itself an episode of that unwieldly compilation. She further points out that Krishna as a full-blown deity (Brahma incarnate) first appears in the relatively recent Atharvan Upanishads composed in the fifth (Dharmashastra) period of Hindu literature, say about 300 to 500 A. D. To the same period is also referred the Gita itself, which is written not in the archaic (vedic) but in the late (classic) Sanskrit of Kalidasa, who flourished about 400-450 A. D., and is the first writer that mentions the Gita.

Lastly, the genesis of the Krishna myth—that is, of Krishna as an avatar of Brahma—is clearly traced from the Chandogya Upanishad (fourth or Sutra period), where Krishna Devakiputra figures only as a man, a pupil of the rishi (sage, seer) Ghora Angirasa, through the early parts of the Mahabharata, where he is a great king and warrior, but still only a man, to Patanjali's Mahabhasya, where he first assumes a semi-divine character (a demi-god), and at last to the Gita, the central idea of which is that

Krishna is Brahma. Even the demi-god stage appears not to have been reached till about 300 B. C., when Megasthenes, the Greek envoy at the Court of Sandrocottos (Chandragupta) tells us that Herakles was worshiped at Methora and Kleisobora. These places are generally identified with Methura and Krishnapur, where homage was paid to Krishna, who at that time would seem to have been a sort of Indian Herakles, whose full apotheosis was finally attained in the Gita, "one of a considerable group of poems which were composed in the fifth period of the literature for the advancement of the worship of Krishna" (Farquhar).

From all this it clearly follows that the gospel narrative could not have been influenced by the Krishna myth, though it is just possible that the latter may have been colored by the former. It is obviously a question of priority which must now be decided in favor of the Christian avatar.—*A. H. Keane.*

CHAPTER V

Did Paul Know of the Virgin Birth?

The argument from silence is made much of in the discussion of this subject. What evidential force there may be in such a method of reasoning depends altogether upon the nature of the question to which the argument is applied. We cannot reason everything out of existence in the history of a people, of an age, or in the life of an individual, simply on the ground that the historian of the period, or the biographer, did not mention every detail. The argument from silence has its uses, as we may hereafter show, but how little dependence can be placed upon it in general is strikingly illustrated by Dr. Drummond. He says[1]:

An instructive instance of the danger of arguing from what is not told is furnished by Theophilus of Antioch. He does not mention the names of the writers of the gospels, except John; he does not tell us anything about any of them; he says nothing about the origin or the date of the gospels themselves or about their use in the Church. He quotes from them extremely little, though he quotes especially from the Old Testament. But most singular of all, in a defense of Christianity, he tells us nothing about Christ himself; if I am not mistaken he does not so much as name him or allude to him; and, if the supposition were not absurd, it might be argued with great plausibility that

[1] *Characteristics and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 157, ff.

he cannot have known anything about him. For he undertakes to explain the origin of the word Christian; but there is not a word about Christ, and his conclusion is *ἡμεῖσ τούτον ἕνεικεν καλουμεθα ὅτι χριόμεθα ἔλαιον θεοῦ* (Ad Autol. i. 12). In the following chapter, when he would establish the doctrine of the resurrection, you could not imagine that he had heard of the resurrection of Christ; and instead of referring to this, he has recourse to the changing seasons, the fortune of seeds, the dying and reappearance of the moon, and the recovery from illness. We may learn from these curious facts that it is not correct to say that a writer knows nothing of certain things simply because he had not occasion to refer to them in his extant writings; or even because he does not mention them when his subject would seem naturally to lead him to do so.

Professor Sanday in his recent work[1] cites a passage from Dr. Dill's *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius.* Dr. Dill is speaking of the *Satiricon* of Petronius. Its authorship is in doubt.

Those who have attributed it to the friend and victim of Nero have been confronted with the silence of Quintilian, Juvenal, and Martial; with the silence of Tacitus as to any literary work by Petronius, whose character and end he has described with a curious sympathy and care. His only late critics of the lower empire, are such as Macrobius, and a dilettante aristocrat like Sidonius Apollinaris, who pay any attention to this remarkable work of genius. And Sidonius seems to make its author a citizen of Marseilles. Yet silence in such cases may be very deceptive. Martial and Statius never mention one another, and both might seem unknown to Tacitus. And Tacitus, after the

[1] *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel,* p. 35, note.

fashion of the Roman aristocrat in painting the character of Petronius, may not have thought it relevant or important to notice a light work such as the *Satiricon,* even if he had ever seen it. He does not think it worth while to mention the histories of the Emperor Claudius, the tragedies of Seneca, or the *Punica* of Silius Italicus.

I have quoted these instances at length not for the purpose of wholly discrediting the argument from silence, but to show that it cannot always be depended upon, and that too much may be made of it altogether. This I think is the case with many writers on the subject of the virgin birth. Professor C. A. Briggs, for instance, in his work on the *Incarnation of Our Lord,* p. 217, seems to state as a fact that the virgin birth of our Lord was unknown to the great apostle of the Gentile Christian Church. He says: "That which is unknown to the teachings of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, Saint John and Saint James, and our Lord himself, and is absent from the earliest and latest gospels, cannot be so essential as many people have supposed." This belief is probably shared by many evangelical scholars, while, of course, among the rationalistic critics in European universities the probability, even, that the Apostle Paul ever heard of such a doctrine is inadmissible. Now, the only reason adduced for this affirmation appears to be that nowhere in his epistles does the apostle expressly mention the virgin birth, or make any direct allusion to it whatever. If he had known, it is assumed, of the miraculous birth, he would certainly have referred to it somewhere in those epistles in which he treats of the person of Christ, but

nowhere is there any evidence that such a birth as is described in the gospels of Matthew and Luke was known to him.

To some perhaps this absence of reference to the virgin birth in the Pauline epistles may appear conclusive that the apostle was wholly ignorant of such a belief or tradition in the Church of his day. But such a conclusion is not conclusive. There may have been many reasons, sufficient to the apostle for the omission, of which we know nothing; but we are not at liberty on that account to invent one. Hilgenfeld thinks Mark omitted mention of the virgin birth out of respect for the antipathy of the Roman Gentiles to such a birth.[1] It is well known that mention of the supernatural birth of Christ is not found in the gospel of John, but to argue from this omission that the author of the fourth gospel knew nothing of the birth story, because he does not expressly refer to it, is wholly uncritical. It is without any historical or other evidence to support it. The simple truth is that, like other errors, it carries with it its own refutation, since it necessarily implies that John knew nothing of the gospels of Matthew and Luke, which narrate the incidents of the virgin birth, while these gospels were well known in Christian communities years before the fourth gospel was written and while the virgin birth of Christ had become one of the great themes of Christian teaching and preaching. Thus Ignatius, on his way to Rome and martyrdom, A. D. 110, writes to the churches in Asia—Ephesus, Symrna, *et al.*—not many years after the probable date of the fourth gospel, that

[1] See *Keim*, vol. 124, note.

the virginity of Mary was among the three mysteries which were "loudly proclaimed." It is difficult to believe that John, the beloved disciple, who took Mary, the holy mother, to his own home after the crucifixion, knew nothing for or against the narrative of the Nativity recorded by Matthew and Luke and which had become the common belief of the Church before he wrote his gospel.

Assumption is sometimes overdone. To assert, for example, as does Professor Briggs, that our Lord knew nothing of his miraculous birth, because he never declared it, is to assume such intimate knowledge of what things Christ did not know that one is inclined to think the chief difficulty with some critics is their omniscience. And with regard to the objection also urged by Professor Briggs, from the silence of the New Testament, a more critical investigation of the subject might suggest that this objection really begs the whole question.[1] Saint Mark, the writer of the "earliest gospel," is silent on the birth of Jesus, but it should also be stated that he passes over with deliberate silence thirty years of our Lord's life, and therefore his silence on this particular fact cannot be construed as evidence of his ignorance. It is significant, however, that he begins his gospel with the striking statement, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Of course it will be objected that these words "the Son of God" were not in the original text of Mark, but were interpolated from John's gospel; that Tischendorf has omitted them in

[1] Since this was written Dr. Briggs seems to have modified his views. See *North American Review*, June, 1906.

the eighth edition of his New Testament; that they are not in the Sinaitic Manuscript, and that their omission by Tischendorf is also justified by Irenæus, Origen, and others who quote the gospel of Mark. But it should also be stated that these words are amply attested by other most ancient manuscripts, as the Codex Vaticanus, and by many ancient versions[1] that the Revised Version inserts them in the text, and that the Sinaitic Manuscript is not and cannot be the sole and absolute authority. Nevertheless, as Keim concedes—and we quote him because he does not accept the doctrine of the virgin birth—"the watchword of the book is the Son of God: nay, going beyond the standpoint of Matthew and Luke, the only, the well-beloved Son of God, who stands high above the angels and next to God himself. Nor is the conception attached to the phrase merely a Messianic one, but that of the most marvelous endowment of spirit and power, a conception which seems to be tacitly based upon a supernatural birth of 'the Son of Mary.' "

As for Saint Paul, we should not expect him to mention the virgin birth unless the logical implications or relation of the particular thought he is unfolding necessarily led him for illustration or proof to historical details of Christ's early life. His various references to events in the life of our Lord show that his knowledge was not confined wholly to things he expressly mentions. His visits to the apostles at Jerusalem must certainly have been fruitful in information concerning the early life of the Christ whom in his epistles he ever contemplates as the risen Lord, but it is clear that the

[1] See *International Critical Commentary,* Mark.

history of our Lord did not fall within the thought circle of Paul's epistles to the Christian communities. His preaching had for its theme the moral or spiritual significance of the Christ, and not the events of his earth-life. While this opinion may not carry sure conviction to every mind, it is at least as reasonable to maintain till a better one is reached as is the contention of those critics who affirm that Paul was unacquainted with the narrative of Christ's birth, as given in the first and third gospels, solely on the ground that no explicit mention is made of it in his epistles. But there is, as we shall see further on, strong presumptive evidence derived from a study of Paul's doctrine of sin and his teaching concerning the sinlessness of Christ, "the Lord from heaven," that the miraculous birth of Christ was known to him and was essentially related to his Christology—indeed that in his mind it was a necessary presupposition of the sinless character of the Christ who came to redeem us from sin. In the epistle to the Romans, chapter 7, the apostle states that the seat of sin is in the flesh, *sarx:* "For I know that in me [that is, in my flesh, *sarx*] dwelleth no good thing." By "flesh" he undoubtedly means corrupt human nature, not the mere material; the "old man," "the body of this death," "the carnal mind," which, not being under the law of the Spirit, is antagonistic to the Spirit and is against God, "for they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit." "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."

This corrupt human nature is the result of primal sin and is universal. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

It is evident, then, that the apostle teaches a universal taint in human nature: that it is fallen, corrupt, dead in sin, unable by the exercise of its own innate powers to overcome the deadening power of the evil which dwells in it and reigns over it. It is also clear that this corrupt quality of human nature is derived through birth by natural laws of propagation from the first progenitor of the race, and is transmitted with the transmission of his fallen nature. He was "of the earth, earthy," and "as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and cannot in the nature of things be other than it is. No being inheriting human nature by natural mode of generation can inherit that nature without inheriting with it all that belongs to it. "The trail of the serpent is over it all." Such is fallen human nature in the epistles of the apostle.

Now in the first chapter of Romans, Paul describes Christ our Lord as having been "made of the seed of David *according to the flesh;* and declared [or demonstrated] to be the Son of God with power, *according to the spirit of holiness,* by the resurrection from the dead." In Gal. 4. 4 he writes, "When the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman." These two passages, and others that may be cited, declare that Jesus Christ was the Son of God and that this Son of God had a human birth. It is a

little remarkable that neither here nor elsewhere does the apostle mention or allude to an earthly father of Jesus. "God sent forth *his* Son, made of a woman." He was of "the *seed* of David" but "demonstrated to be the *Son* of God." The birth is human, but the parentage is divine.

Further, Paul distinctly teaches that this Jesus, "made of the seed of David according to the flesh," "made of a woman," *was without sin.* He is the Saviour from sin, the judge of sin, 2 Cor. 5. 10. In the thought of the apostle sin in Christ is absolutely inconceivable, since he is "the Son of God," he is the "Creator of all things," the holy, immaculate One, and "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." In 2 Cor. 5. 21 he expressly declares the sinlessness of Jesus when he says, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." But Paul's doctrine of human sin is that "all have sinned," that all human nature is radically depraved through inheritance of a fallen nature from Adam all down through human history, and involving every being coming into the world.

How can we reconcile this with the sinlessness of Jesus if Paul knew that Jesus was born of an earthly father and mother, human creatures equally involved in the sin and innate depravity of the race? Here is an utterly irreconcilable difference, a far-reaching antagonism between his declaration of the sinlessness of Jesus and his doctrine of universal human depravity. For he must have known, and he did know and teach, that if there is a moral taint in the human race, if in the very blood and constitution of humanity there is

an ineradicable tendency to sin, then it is utterly inconceivable that *anyone* born in the race by natural means should escape the taint of that race. And we may say here that if the virgin birth is not historical, then a difficulty greater than any that destructive criticism has yet evolved from documents, interpolations, psychological improbabilities, and unconscious contradictions confronts the reason and upsets all the long results of scientific observation: that a sinful and deliberately unmarried and sinning human pair should have given life to the purest human that ever lived or of which the human race has ever dreamed. But there is a difficulty here with which rationalism must reckon; for as Bishop Goodsell remarks in his masterful little book,[1] "If the new doctrine of heredity be true, that men may inherit good as well as evil, we still have an astounding fact to account for: namely, the birth of such a child from such conditions—that is, with all the good kept in and all the bad kept out." Science knows no such miracle, and it becomes the task of destructive criticism to explain the supernatural phenomenon.

We are justified by the intellectual character of his writings in believing that Paul was too serious a thinker not to have seen this seemingly irreconcilable discrepancy in his doctrinal teaching, and we have no doubt that this yawning chasm of contradiction would have been just as clear to him as it is to us, and that some light would have been shed on the subject had he not known anything of the supernatural birth. For it must have been self-evident to

[1] *The Things which Remain.*

him that, if Christ was born of human parents as all others are born, then his human nature, like the nature of others, must have been tainted with the sin of the race, and he could not have written "God made him sin for us, who knew no sin." Nor if Paul wrote the epistle to the Hebrews could he have declared that Christ, born of human parents, "was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin." Such statements by Paul with his doctrine of universal and inbred depravity would have been simply impossible.

Moreover, Paul's doctrine of atonement and free grace would utterly fall, since if Christ was born with sin in his own nature, which was derived as a whole by natural means from parents involved like all others in Adamic transgression and the moral infirmity of the race, he could not be, according to the Pauline doctrine of atonement and redemption, the Saviour of sinners. But "God *made* him sin for us, *who knew no sin.*" "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while *we were yet sinners,* Christ died for us," Rom. 5. 8; "Who was *delivered* for *our* offenses, and was raised again for *our* justification," Rom. 4. 25. In no sense, according to the Pauline teaching, did Jesus suffer for himself. *He died for us.* If, however, it is granted that the supernatural birth was fully known to the apostle the apparent difficulty, or rather contradiction, in his entire teaching immediately vanishes. Nor can the irreconcilability be removed otherwise. Christ then would not be included in the same category with fallen humanity. He is a new Power coming into humanity, the head of a new race, and as such the apostle conceives him: the second Adam, a "new

creation," the "last Adam," as distinguished from the "first Adam"; for "the first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven."

It will probably be objected that the difficulty here pointed out is not much relieved by eliminating descent from both parents, since the sin of the race must also have clung to the nature of the mother; and, *secondly,* that Paul's unexpressed knowledge or belief concerning the virgin birth would have given no assistance to those to whom his epistles were sent in reconciling the discrepancy in his teaching.

With reference to the first objection we may say this subject will be treated more fully hereafter. What we are now considering is whether Paul knew of the supernatural birth. As to the second objection, it assumes that the Christian communities to which Paul wrote were ignorant of the events in the life of Christ who was preached to them. There is no evidence of this. Even if we concede that the gospels are of a very late date, it must never be lost sight of that the gospels were preached before they were written, otherwise there would have been scant foundation for the epistles. Oral instruction preceded written communications, as we see in the case of Theophilus, Luke 1. At any rate, it is evident from a study of the Pauline theology that Paul himself was not ignorant of the virgin birth of our Lord.

As we shall probably see, other considerations, not theological but historical, lead to the same conclusion. Modern scholarship, notwithstanding the opposition of the older critics, Köstlin, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, Strauss, and others, concedes that the author of the

Acts of the apostles and of the third gospel was Luke, the fellow worker and companion of Saint Paul. The book of Acts records his travels with the apostle, and Paul in his epistles, Col. 4. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. 4. 11, speaks of Luke. There is no doubt whatever that he spent much time with the apostle in Rome. Now that these two missionaries of the cross, preaching the new doctrine of redemption through Jesus Christ, should never in all their long journeyings and companionship in many lands have traversed with each other the history of the Christ is, on the face of it, incredible. There is no need of demonstrative proof that their individual knowledge would be mutually shared. It is a presupposition of common sense. Many writers of opposite schools emphasize the influence of Paul in the gospel of Luke. It is well known that Irenæus and others of the early Church thought Luke's gospel was as much Paul's as it was Luke's. "They came to this conclusion," says Keim, "from the person of the traditionary author as well as from the contents, and were even of opinion that Paul had in his epistles referred to this, *his* gospel. On the other hand, it can undoubtedly be shown that Luke has, in the gospel, by allusion praised and vindicated Paul." "Among recent critics there is no longer any dispute as to the existence of this Pauline tendency." "Much, in fact, appears altogether Pauline, especially where compared with the gospel of the Jewish Christians."

We do not have to indorse all of these statements in order to show the intimate relations between the apostle and the evangelist. But the point to be impressed is that this same Luke, the long-time fellow worker

with Paul, is the author of that very gospel which contains the fullest account of the virgin birth. Can we suppose, then, that Luke never mentioned the subject to the apostle? never narrated the facts which would constitute his gospel? In order to assume this we must go further and assume that, during all these years of intimate fellowship with Paul, Luke himself was ignorant of the story of the virgin birth; nay, that up to the writing of Paul's latest epistle, A. D. 68, when he suffered martyrdom, Luke was still ignorant of the wonderful story. But, in that case, what time would be left to him for the gathering with minute care of all the facts of Christ's earthly history and the composition of his gospel—which, according to Keim, was in the year 70 A. D.—and how old would he then be for such a task? Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker, Volkmar, and a few others indeed put the date of Luke's gospel yet later, about A. D. 100, but the majority of scholars place it earlier than A. D. 70. It will certainly be conceded that Luke was for some time in possession of the leading facts of his gospel before he set himself the task of composition, and there is in this sufficient ground for the belief that the knowledge of the life of our Lord possessed by Luke was equally the possession of the apostle Paul.

Having seen that the Pauline Christology presupposes the virgin birth of our Lord, notwithstanding the fact that it is never expressly mentioned by the apostle, there is yet other evidence which may claim consideration, even though it should fail to fully convince those who are thoroughly committed to a contrary view. In order to show this it must be conceded

that if Paul knew of Luke's gospel he must have known that, according to the carefully ascertained statements of Luke, Christ was born of a virgin, and that that fact was among the beliefs "fully established," and was a part of the teachings in which Christians were orally instructed, as was Theophilus. Certainly he could not have known Luke's gospel without knowing the contents of that gospel.

It is but fair, however, to state that scarcely a biblical critic in Europe or in America, especially among rationalists, will maintain that the gospels of Matthew or Luke were known to Paul the apostle. The consensus of opinion is against such an hypothesis. Menzies[1] says, "The writers of the epistles do not quote any such book as the gospels; they speak very little about the matters with which the gospels deal. . . . This is no more than to say that the epistles were written before the gospels." Julicher[2] says, "That Matthew was composed after the year 70 is conclusively proved by chapter 28. 19," and he is inclined to fix the date at about A. D. 100; for "a Christian who would summarize the task of the Christian missionaries in the words 'baptize them . . . and teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,' who is already familiar with the baptismal formula expressed in Trinitarian terms, can scarcely belong to the first century." He also says,[3] "That Luke was written some time *after* the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 is proved beyond question by 21. 21-24." The first

[1] *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 5.
[2] *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 308.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

epistle to the Corinthians was written about A. D. 56; 2 Cor. he places at 57 A. D. Of 1 Thess. he says that the epistle could hardly have been written before 53 (for the end of 52 is the earliest date at which Paul could have set foot on European soil) and certainly not after 54. Harnack says, "Ist Paulus 54 (53 in Jerusalem) gefangen gesetzt worden, so gehoren die Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Galater, Korinther, Romer vor diese zeit." Abbott (*Encyclop. Biblica,* vol. 11, col. 1825) contends that "Paul quotes nothing that is found in our gospels." Plummer (*Internat. Criti. Com.,* Luke) states that "the main theories respecting the date of the third gospel contend respectively for a time in or near the years A. D. 100, A. D. 80, and A. D. 63," dates—except the last, if Paul was martyred in 68—which preclude the possibility of Paul having known of the gospel by Luke. There are others who insist upon a later date. Among those who fix the date at A. D. 95-105, and even so late as A. D. 120-135, are Baur, Davidson, Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Overbeck, Schwegler, Scholten, Volkmar, Weizsäcker, Wittlicher, and Zeller.

In the face of such expert opinion, which seems to take no account of how old Luke must have been when he composed his gospel, if these wild dates are to be accepted, it may doubtless seem a hopeless task to overthrow the assumption that Paul knew nothing of the first and third gospels, and a somewhat hazardous undertaking to prove, on the success of such an attempt, that he was acquainted with narratives of the virgin birth. But there are certain evidences in the Pauline epistles which indicate that Paul was ac-

quainted with these gospels, notwithstanding the opinions of Menzies and of Abbott that Paul "quotes nothing" from Matthew or Luke. Full justice cannot be given the subject if we consider the array of names against the evidence rather than the evidence itself, and especially if we concede to the advocates of a late date for the gospels the unestablished grounds for their contention. What, then, is the evidence sufficiently strong to suggest the probability that Paul was acquainted with the gospels of Matthew and Luke and therefore with the doctrine of the virgin birth?

The author of *Supernatural Religion,* which from the rationalistic standpoint is recognized as the most scholarly work produced in England, endeavors to prove in chapter v that the speech of Stephen before the Sanhedrin was not delivered by him at all, but, like the speeches put in the mouths of celebrated characters by Latin and Greek historians, is a composition of Luke, the author of the Acts. "The majority of apologists," he observes, "suppose that the speech was heard and reported by the apostle Paul himself, or at least by a member of the Sanhedrin, or by someone who was present. As there is no information on the point there is ample scope for imagination, but when we come to consider its linguistic and other peculiarities it must be borne in mind that the extreme difficulty of explaining the preservation of such a speech must be an element in judging whether it is not rather a composition by the author of the Acts. . . . It is maintained that the language is more or less that of the writer of the rest of the work, and that the speech, in fact, as it lies before us is a later composition by the

author of the Acts of the apostles." He then proceeds to show by the constant use of words which may be regarded as characteristic of or peculiar to the author of the Acts and the third gospel, and which same words are employed in the speech of Stephen, that the speech is not Stephen's but Luke's. At the close of the exhaustive presentation which he gives in evidence he says: "It is impossible, we think, to examine this analysis, in which we might fairly have included other points which we have passed over, without feeling the conviction that the speech of Stephen was composed by the author of the rest of the Acts of the apostles." Now if this principle of literary criticism is valid in the hands of rationalists it must be equally valid when employed by those who are not rationalists, and no objection can be made to the conclusions logically resulting from its use because they are not in the interest of rationalistic theories. We shall employ this principle in the attempt to show that the apostle Paul was acquainted with the gospels of Matthew and Luke.

And first as to Matthew: Harnack puts the date of this gospel at 70-75. Jülicher, as we have seen, after 70; the *Encyclop. Biblica* and the *Expositor's Greek Test.* also after 70; Professor Bacon 80-90; Lange 67-69; Bruce shortly after 70; Holtzman, Moffatt, Bernhard Weiss, and Sanday range from 70-90; while Pfleiderer and Schmiedel fix its date after 100, the latter at about 130 A. D. Now in Matt. 10. 9, 10, we read, *"Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman*

is worthy of his meat." In 1 Cor. 9. 14, writing on the same subject, the support of the ministry, Paul says: *"Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."* The "Lord" here is certainly Jesus, who ordained this in Matt. 10. 9, 10, and also in Luke 10. 7, *but nowhere else.* Compare Matt. 19. 28, *"When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel,"* with 1 Cor. 6. 2, 3, *"Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? . . . know ye not that we shall judge angels?"* Also Matt. 17. 20. 21, *"If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove,"* with 1 Cor. 13. 2, *"Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains."* In Matt. 24. 36, 43, we read, *"But of that day and hour knoweth no man. . . . But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in which watch the thief would have come, he would have watched."* And in 1 Thess. 5. 2, Paul writes: *"For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night."*

This comparison of texts in which identical *thought* is found may not be conclusive evidence in itself that Paul had read the gospel of Matthew, but the more we study these texts, the context, the setting of the thought which is identical in Paul's epistles and Matthew's gospel, the more will the conviction grow that the resemblances are not accidental, that the dates assigned by extremists for Matthew's gospel are all probably too late, and that the apostle had not only read

this gospel himself, but that, in referring to or using certain teachings contained therein, he knew that the Christian communities to which he wrote would understand him and note the harmony of his teaching with the exact words of their Lord as recorded in the gospel.

It is in the gospel of Luke, however, that the most remarkable and the more numerous coincidences of thought and expression with texts in Paul's epistles are found. The striking similarity of the passages compared can be fully appreciated only by a study of the texts in Greek, but the use of the English Revised Version will be of much assistance.

Comparison Between Paul and Luke

Luke's Gospel.	Paul's Epistles.	Luke's Gospel.	Paul's Epistles.
4. 22.	Col. 4. 6; Eph. 4. 29.	11. 41.	Titus 1. 15.
4. 32.	1 Cor. 2. 4.	11. 49.	1 Thess. 2. 15.
6. 36.	2 Cor. 1. 3; Rom. 12. 1.	12. 35.	Eph. 6. 14.
6. 39.	Rom. 2. 19.	12. 42.	1 Cor. 4. 2.
6. 48.	1 Cor. 3. 10.	20. 17, 18.	Rom. 9. 33.
8. 15.	Col. 1. 10, 11.	21. 19.	Rom. 2. 7.
10. 8.	1 Cor. 10. 27.	21. 24.	Rom. 11. 25.
10. 20.	Phil. 4. 3.	21. 34.	1 Thess. 5. 3–8.
10. 21.	1 Cor. 1. 19, 27	21. 36.	2 Cor. 5. 10.
11. 36.	Eph. 5. 13.		

In 1 Cor. 7. 10, the apostle forbidding divorce says, "I give charge, yet not I but the Lord," and in this charge he is evidently quoting Matt. 5. 31, 32, or *Logia*, used by Matthew. It will be noted that Paul not only knows what the Lord commanded, he also knows what he did *not* ordain when he writes, "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord," for what follows verses 12-16 is not found in any of our Lord's discourses.

Again, the quite remarkable coincidence between 1 Cor. 11 and Luke 22 will not escape the critical student. Nor will the statement of the apostle in 1 Thess. 4 and 5 where he affirms he is describing the second coming of Christ "in the language of the Lord" (*ἐν λόγιῳ κυρίου*) referring to the discourse in Matt. 24. 31 and not, as Lüneman thinks, to a special revelation to Paul.

Then the close similarity between Luke 21. 34-36 and 1 Thess. 5 demands more than ordinary attention. The coincidences of thought and language in these passages are most surprising, and cannot be accounted for on the ground of mere "accident."

LUKE 21. 34.	1 THESS. 5. 3–8.
But take heed to yourselves, lest . . . your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come on you [*ἐπιστῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*) suddenly [*ἀιφνίδιος*).	Let us . . . watch and be sober. For . . . they that be drunk-enare drunken in the night. But let us, who are of the day, be sober. . . . Sudden [*ἀιφνίδιος*] destruction come upon thee (*ἀνηροῖσ επίσταται*).

But let it be insisted upon that Paul did not use Luke's gospel as we now have it, that is, that he could not have seen Luke's manuscript. Then, even so, there is yet other evidence which will go far to prove that if he did not use Luke's manuscript he did use Luke's material. It is now generally conceded that back of the synoptic gospels there were original sources, *Logia,* which were used by the evangelists. The language of these *sayings* was doubtless Aramaic. It is well known that the church father Papias states that Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew which, while Hebrew is not Aramaic—and Delitzsch will not allow that Matthew wrote in Aramaic—may leave us

some ground for belief that Aramaic is really what Papias meant, since Hebrew was not in common use when Matthew wrote. It is confirmatory of the above view, however, that, as Professor J. T. Marshall shows,[1] some of the variations between statements in Luke's gospel and the same in Paul's epistles are easily explained when the words in question are translated into Aramaic. For example, in the passage above (Luke 21), we read, "And lest that day come upon you suddenly as a *snare*" (ὡσ παγίσ). Paul writes (1 Thess. 5), "Sudden destruction cometh on them as *travail* (ὥσπερ ἡ ὠδίν) upon a woman with child." The discrepancy between the two words *snare* and *travail* is unexplainable, but if both writers used a common source written in Hebrew or in Aramaic the difficulty disappears. Professor Marshall goes on to show that the Hebrew word for "snare" is חֶבֶל, for "travail" חֵבֶל. The consonants are identical; and they are all that were written in those days, for Hebrew vowels are a comparatively modern invention. Now this word in Hebrew might mean either "snare" or "travail," and as Saint Paul, being versed in Daniel's prophecy concerning the advent of the Messiah in judgment, the events of that period being called among the Jews "the birth-pangs of the Messiah" he chose to render it "travail," while Luke, not fully understanding all that was meant, rendered it "snare." This is only one of the many instances which might be cited to suggest that Paul was acquainted if not with Luke's gospel certainly with the sources of that gospel, and if with the

[1] In *The Expositor*, 1891, Fourth Series, vol. iii.

original Hebrew or Aramaic sources employed by Luke then, in all probability, with the early chapters containing the narrative of Christ's birth which eminent critics affirm Luke preserves in their Aramaic coloring.

Now it seems a little difficult to believe that these remarkably close similarities in the writings of these two authors are purely accidental. Neither were the subjects discussed so narrow nor the copious Greek tongue so poverty-stricken that these writers were compelled by fortuitous combinations of such conditions to employ identical words for the expression of identical thoughts. We do not find such coincidences of word and thought between Mark and Paul, nor between Paul and John. But here they are in abundance between Paul and Luke, two writers who were companions for years, and one of whom, it is insisted by biblical critics, profoundly influenced the historical writings of the other. How can these similarities and identities of thought and language be accounted for? There is a parallel case in patrology. Critical scholars such as Tischendorf, Lücke, Weizsäcker, against Ewald, Baur, Volkmar, and others, contend that Justin Martyr was acquainted with the gospel of John. The proof of this is that in the writings of Justin there are passages incontestably Johannine, as, for example, "I am not the Christ, but a voice crying in the desert," which is undoubtedly from John 1. 21, 23. "Which were begotten not of blood nor of men, but of the will of God," which is certainly taken from John 1. 13. He also quotes the passage referring to the new birth, John 3. 4; also Christ's exclusive knowledge of the

Father, John 16. 3, and several other Johannine texts, as 5. 19, 45; 8. 17; 13. 34, all of which leads to no other conclusion than that Justin Martyr had before him John's gospel.

There are many other examples. For instance, in his apology, i. c. 32, Justin writes: *οἱ πιστεύοντες αὐτῷ εισιν ἄνθρωποι ἐν οἷς οἰκει το παρα του θεοῦ σπέρμα, ὁ λόγος.* That is: *Those who believe in him are men in whom dwells the seed of God, the Logos.* Can we deny that Justin had ever seen 1 John 3. 9: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin: for his seed remaineth in him"? or 1 John 2. 14: "I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word [*ὁ λόγος*] of God abideth [*μένει*, remains] in you." Compare Ignatius, *Epistle to the Ephesians,* c. 11. 1, with 1 John 2. 18; 5. 20; Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians,* c. 7. 1, with 1 John 4. 3; Irenæus, Bk. v. 2. 3, with Eph. 5. 30, or Bk. v. 14. 3, with Eph. 1. 7; 2. 11-15; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Pædeg.* i. 5, with Eph. 4. 13, 14; or Clement of Rome, in his first *Epistle to the Corinthians,* c. 16. 1, with Phil. 2. 5; Polycarp in his *Epistle to the Philippians,* c. 2. 1, with Phil. 2. 10; 1 Cor. 15. 28. In the old Latin version of Irenæus, Bk. v. iii. 14. 1, we read *Et iterum in Ea Epistola quae Est ad Colosenses, ait "Salutet vos Lucas medicus delectus."* However exacting criticism may be, no one who compares these known references of Ignatius, Polycarp, Clemens, Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, with the texts of Scripture can doubt that they had ever seen those texts. We cannot doubt that Irenæus had before him Paul's epistle to the Colossians when he wrote, as above, "Luke the beloved physician salutes you."

Similar examples in abundance can be cited from secular literature. Shakespeare, for instance, in Henry VIII 3. 2, makes Wolsey say, "Cherish those hearts that hate thee." Did he know nothing of the text in Matt. 5. 44, "Do good to them that hate you"? In Richard III 1. 3 we read, "My name be blotted from the Book of life," and in Rev. 17. 8, "Whose names were not written in the Book of life." In Henry IV 3. 3 we read, "Dives that lived in purple," and in Luke 16. 22, "There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple." In Richard III 2. 3, "Woe to the land that is governed by a child"; in Eccl. 10. 6, "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child." In Henry IV 1. 2, "Wisdom cries out in the streets and no man regards it"; and in Prov. 1. 20, "Wisdom crieth without: she uttereth her voice in the streets." In Richard III 1. 4, "How fain, like Pilate, would I wash my hands of this most grievous murther!" and in Matt. 28. 24, "Pilate . . . took water and washed his hands . . . saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person." Shall we, can we, convince ourselves that Shakespeare never read these texts in Holy Scripture?

It is quite true that one may deny that the passages in the Pauline epistles and Luke's gospel are of such close similarity that their likeness compels belief in Paul's knowledge of Luke's gospel, but a mere denial will not be sufficient when we consider the relationship of Paul and Luke, the nature of those texts, and the tradition of the early Church. There is much more convincing evidence, in a critical analysis of the words, thoughts, and phrases in these texts, that the

apostle did make free use of Luke's gospel than the author of *Supernatural Religion* produced from his sifting examination of the words and arguments in Stephen's speech to prove that the author of the Acts, and not Stephen, was the author of that speech. When we read in Luke 10. 8, "And into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you" (*ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν*), and then read in 1 Cor. 10. 27, "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go, whatsoever it set before you, eat" (*πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ὑμῖν ἐσθίετε*); or when we read in Luke 6. 36, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful" (*ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστί*), and then read in 2 Cor. 1. 3, "Blessed be God . . . the Father of mercies" (*ὁ πατὴρ των οἰκτιρμῶν*); and many other passages whose puzzling similarity is clearly seen in the Greek; when we compare these parallels closely the presumptive evidence becomes very convincing that the apostle was fully acquainted with the gospel of Luke and that his mind was saturated with the teachings of our Lord. Where else is it recorded, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel" but in Matt. 10. 9, 10, and Luke 10. 7? It would be remarkable, then, that the apostle should know these passages in the gospels of Matthew and Luke but did not know the narratives of the virgin birth contained in both these same gospels.

From this survey, then, of the kinds of evidence there does appear to be at least strong presumptive evidence that the virgin birth of our Lord was not unknown to the apostle Paul.

CHAPTER VI

The Sinless Christ

The conclusions reached concerning Paul's knowledge of the virgin birth lead now to larger views of the New Testament teaching on this subject as a whole, and a critical study of this New Testament teaching will serve to show how unreliable is the argument from silence. For, in the first place, it will be found that the virgin birth of our Lord must be regarded as a *necessary presupposition* in the mind of writers of the gospels and epistles. Without this presupposition no intelligible concept of Christ can be obtained from their delineation of him, or of their interpretation of his doctrine; indeed the entire body of teaching in the New Testament, void of this presupposition, becomes a chaotic mass of irreconcilabilities or half wrought out ideas and tangled contradictions.

Now, without doubt, the fourth gospel teaches the preëxistence of the Logos in that marvelous opening: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God; and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. . . . And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." This also is the doctrine of the synoptic gospels, and in harmony with this we must interpret the Petrine teaching. John, in his gospel, declares that "in him was life," that is, in him life had

its source. And Peter declares to the multitude in the Temple that they "killed the Prince of life," Acts 3. 15. These writers certainly did not interpret Christ as a mere man, nor even as a God-filled man, no matter how wonderfully or supernaturally endowed he may have appeared to them. Further, nothing is clearer in the Pauline Christology than that the apostle teaches not, as Beyschlag and Pfleiderer imagine, an ideal existence of Christ in the divine thought, but a real personal preëxistence in the being of God, whom he declares to be "the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature, for by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers: all things were created by him and for him," Col. 1. 15, 16. In Philippians the apostle also declares that prior to his manifestation in the "form of a servant" in "the likeness of men," Christ had "the form of God" and was "equal with God," Phil. 2. 6, 7. In Heb. 1. 3, which is in perfect harmony with Col. 1. 15, 16, and in John 1. 4, our Lord is affirmed to be the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power.

From all this it appears that the unequivocal teaching of the New Testament is that Christ had real, personal existence in the Being of God, was equal with God and was God. He existed personally from eternity, the eternal image of the eternal substance. He also, as the eternal Logos, possessed creative power, and by him were all worlds spoken into being. He is the Head of creation, the Agent by which and the

eternal reason why it exists, for "all things were created *by* him and *for* him." The reason Why of the universe is in Christ, and in him alone is what Paul designates as "the purpose of the ages," the realization of the eternal ideal, the

> "one far off divine event
> Toward which the whole creation moves."

Now, it does not seem logically possible to hold belief in this preëxistence of Christ and also belief in the New Testament doctrine of his creative power, "by which he made the worlds," and at the same time deny the virgin birth. This is a large saying, and for its justification there is need of convincing proof; but the proof is at hand in the following appeal to rational thought.

Every birth, by ordinary generation, is the coming into this life of a *new personality*. If, then, Christ was born in this ordinary way of human parents we are compelled to the irrational but inevitable conclusion, as Ebrard points out,[1] that the eternally existing Logos first came into personal being by such human means; that is, we must believe the absurd, namely, that the human begat the Divine, the finite the Infinite, the temporal the Eternal. Reflection will show that we cannot hold this belief of the natural birth of Christ and accept the New Testament doctrine of Christ's preëxistence. One or the other must surrender to the demands of reason. Again, in our efforts to maintain faith in the New Testament doctrine of the preëxistence of Christ we may assume, as

[1] *Apologetics*, vol. ii, Eng. trans.

a way out of our difficulty, that human parents begat the human being Jesus, and that with the Ego, or *self*, of this being the Ego of the preëxisting Logos united itself. But there is no rationality in this lame concept either, for in this supposition we have one Ego in two persons—an unthinkable *status*—or else we shall have two Egos in two persons; which is nothing more than a mere *conjunction* of personalities and is not an incarnation at all. There is a union (ἕνωσις) of two natures in Christ, though not a conjunction (συνάφεια) as Nestorius declared. And this union (ἕνωσις) must also be distinguished from κρᾶσις or σύγχυσις a mere *blending* of the natures, as it is from ἐνοίκησις an *indwelling* of God in the human nature. But if rational thought can not accept either of the above suppositions neither can it accept the supposition that the human parents generated a *mere germ* in which there was no potential soul or spirit, nothing but the germ of a body which, if it grew up, would have no soul or spirit; and that into this germ the preëxisting Logos entered, becoming its soul, its spirit. This, it will be seen, would be as miraculous as the virgin birth, and is not only contrary to all known natural law but is in itself unthinkable. Certainly if we deny the preëxistence of Christ there is no need of belief in the virgin birth, nor in the necessity of it; but then we also discard the clearest teachings of the New Testament. There is left to us therefore only the plain historical statements of the gospels, which form the presuppositions of the New Testament writers; which statements are not contrary to natural law nor to human reason when we contemplate the works, teaching, and cosmic pur-

pose of the divine Life which manifested itself among men.

Furthermore, if we are to believe the New Testament doctrine of the preëxisting Christ, the infinitely holy Son of God, reason demands that there shall be a *fitting organ* for this manifestation. The modern doctrine of evolution insists upon the development of the human body from lower forms, but when the problem of the rational mind enters then the real trouble begins.[1] Evolution cannot account for mind. Much has been written to suggest animal intelligence as preparing the way for reason, which lifts man so far above the brute that he stands alone in the universe; but neither by animal intelligence nor by the evolution of a finer nervous system can the rational and the moral life of man be accounted for. Freedom can never be born of necessity. The mind—the free rational soul of man—cannot be a product of evolution, for there is nothing in nature from which it can be evolved. It is the product of something beyond nature, a something which had in itself the powers and qualities of the rational mind.

But if the conclusions of biologists who affirm the development of the human body from brute ancestors be accepted; if it be granted that evolution did produce the higher brain from a lower brain; if it is also granted that in this developed brain the human spirit, the rational, thinking, self-knowing mind was placed—that at that moment the *thing* thus endowed became Man—then of what conceivable use or benefit would that brute brain have been to the rational spirit if

[1] See Godet, *Biblical Studies*, N. T., p. 89.

through any lack of concomitancy, of quick response to the thoughts of the thinker within, it failed to meet the needs of that spirit? Think of the soul of a Mozart or a Beethoven in the brain of an ape! The human brain is three times heavier than the ape's and one half larger. A child's brain, four years old, weighs ordinarily from 38 to 40 ounces, and the average adult brain from 46 to 50 ounces.[1] But the heaviest ape brain yet weighed was not more than 15 ounces. The relative cranial capacity of man and ape should also be noticed. The lowest average capacity of the human cranium is 77 cubic inches; from this it runs up among the Australians to 82 cubic inches; among the Africans to 85 cubic inches; the Esquimaux 91; among the great Germanic family 94. But the cranium of the full grown orang-outang is only 28 cubic inches, the gorilla 30—the largest gorilla cranium yet found reaching a capacity not greater than 34½ cubic inches. There is, then, between the capacity of the largest gorilla cranium and the lowest human a difference of 42½ cubic inches (77—34½=42½). If now we compare the average gorilla skull with the average Teutonic or Celtic the capacity of the human is seen to be three times greater than that of the gorilla, the difference being 64 inches. The nerves must also be considered for a moment. The nerves of the ape are larger and coarser than those of man. In man the nerve fibers, which condition activities of the mind, measure 1| 200 part of a line, and the central fibers in the brain are incomparably finer. In one square inch *six millions* of these fibers are closely packed, and

[1] *Doctrine of the Resurrection,* Cooke, p. 88, ff.

when we see, as above, that a human cranium has a capacity of 94 cubic inches we cannot but be astonished at the marvelous richness of equipment demanded in the organism that is fitted to become the abode of this thinking spirit. The human soul cannot live in the brain of an ape. There is no coördination, no correspondence. Apes never predict an eclipse, weigh the stars, measure their orbits, build empires, or, like Kepler, think God's thoughts after him. The instrument must be fitted to the hand. For the human spirit, nature must build an adequate organism; and never through all the ages of evolution does the human spirit, or the works of that spirit, appear till adequate organism is ready for its use. Fitness is the hall-mark of the universe.

The analogy, we think, is clear. If the Holy One of God, the eternal Logos, appears among men he must have an adequate organ for his manifestation. Human nature is adequate, but not a degenerate human nature, vibrant to sinful tendencies, ruled by desires, appetites, and passions which bring sorrow and shame to the best of the race. He must have a nature which shall be clean and holy, a nature untainted by hereditary evil—a pure nature for the pure person. Christianity demands even of men inheriting the sin of the world that their bodies shall be "the temples of the Holy Ghost." "Know ye not," wrote the apostle to the Corinthian Christians, "that your bodies are the members of Christ? . . . Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?" By the power of the indwelling Spirit

the body of the Christian must be brought under subjection to the law of the Spirit of holiness, so that it shall become, by the disuse of its passions and appetites, the responsive servant, the adequate organ, of the pure spirit, rather than the inciter to sin and the occasion of conflict and unrest in the soul that, having put off the old man with his deeds, aspires to holiness in Christ Jesus. How much more, then, in the nature of things, is it necessary that he who came to redeem men from sin should himself be without sin; that he who "condemned sin in the flesh" should himself be without sin in his own flesh! An immaculate spirit demands an immaculate organism.

Now, that Christ was absolutely sinless is the teaching of the Scriptures. His own clear challenge to sinful men about him, "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" is an expression of his holy, sinless consciousness. He knew he had no sin. He could be tempted and yet the temptation was sinless in origin and result. He was not exempt from hunger and thirst and weariness, sorrow and regret, desire for rest, the yearning for sympathy, friendship and love, from any of the innocent instincts, physical and mental, of our nature. *He suffered being tempted: he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin,* Heb. 2. 18; 4. 15. There were no evil tendencies in his nature enticing him to swerve in his fidelity to God. The paltry attempts of Strauss, Pecaut, Schenkel, Hase, and a few others, to find flaws in the immaculate purity of his life find no encouragement even among those who, while denying his divinity, are yet compelled to cry out, with Pilate, "I find no fault in

him."[1] The purity of Jesus is the guarantee of his doctrine.

But whence this nature—so human, yet sinless? Whence this exalted human nature so fitted to his holy nature? Paul says he came in the *"likeness* of sinful flesh," and the epistle to the Hebrews declares that he took not on him the nature of angels, but "as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also partook of the same." How could he assume this "flesh and blood" and not with it assume also its sin and moral degeneracy? Here is the problem which deniers of the virgin birth can never solve except by denying the sinless character of the Christ, and thus renouncing altogether his divine character. With the virgin birth goes the virgin life. If Christ was born of human parents he could not, as we have observed in the Pauline doctrine of sin, have escaped the moral taint inherent in human nature unless we assume that both parents were miraculously prepared by divine grace, which is contrary to the historic facts, and were thus delivered from the sinful quality inherent in their natures. Even if this were so, it only doubles the miracle without bringing to the mind a satisfactory, restful solution. On the contrary, it brings us up with a short stop against one of the irrational conclusions

[1] Harnack notes the absence of sin-consciousness in Jesus when he says, "Everything seems to pour from him naturally as though it could not do otherwise, like a spring from the depths of the earth, clear and unchecked in its flow. Where shall we find the man who at the age of thirty can so speak, as if he had gone through bitter struggles—struggles of the soul—in which he has ended by burning what he once adored and by adoring what he burned? Where shall we find the man who has broken with his past, in order to summon others to repentance as well as himself, but who through it all never speaks of his own repentance?"—*What is Christianity?*, p. 36. Trans. by T. B. Saunders.

before mentioned: one Ego in two persons, or a conjunction of personalities. The sinless nature, however, must be accounted for. It is before us, and we cannot ignore it. It was not an accident. It was a moral necessity demanded by the Incarnation; as much so as an organism adapted to the needs of the thinking soul was a necessary physical condition of man's entrance into this world. A holy God in a corrupt human nature would be as great a monstrosity, as much an offense against the eternal fitness of things, as would be the soul of a Newton or of a Gladstone in the brain of a gibbering ape. There must be no discord between the flesh and the spirit, no struggle between the upper and the lower, no yearning of the imprisoned soul in its agony to

> "Arise and fly
> The reeling Faun, the Sensual feast,
> . . . working out the beast;
> *Letting* the ape and tiger die."

And so we find it in Jesus—in him, and in him alone—as the greatest moral miracle of time. In him there is no sense of sin, no regret over moral delinquencies or weaknesses. In him there rise no fumes of smoldering passion or darkening mists of doubt which, like floating clouds hiding the face of the sun in the uttermost sky, intercept the radiance of the Father's face, or break his immediate communion with God. His physical life has its roots in a spotless physical nature. Such was human nature when fresh from the hand of its Creator. Sin was no part of it, neither in it, nor attached to it, nor necessary to it; but, on the contrary, destructive of it. This human nature Christ assumed,

but where did he get it? After we have worked our way through and around all sides of this mighty question, testing all theories and hypotheses, the only answer that comes to us, the only answer which meets all demands of reason, and the only answer which can ever solve the problem, is the announcement of the angel to the mother of Jesus: *"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."*

The objection to this is that it involves the miraculous. It does. But, if this is miraculous, so also was the first introduction of life on this planet miraculous; so also was the first appearance of a thinking, self-knowing mind miraculous; since, notwithstanding the opinions of Darwin and Professor Huxley a generation ago that the difference between man and beast is in degree and not in kind, it is now the verdict of science that the gulf between man and brute in the region of mind and moral freedom is impassable. The miracle, however, in this instance is the least possible departure from the ordinary laws of nature; parthenogenesis is common among certain lower orders of life; but, whatever the difficulties may be, the miraculous must be accepted if any other mode for accounting for facts is found contrary to reason. From this conclusion there is no escape.[1]

[1] In answer to the question, If Jesus Christ is truly man must he not have been born in the same manner as every other man? Godet says pertinently that such an objection would oblige us "to deny true humanity to the first man upon the ground that he came into existence by a different process from that of ordinary human filiation." And this would be true even if we accepted the Darwinian hypothesis, which applies only to the body.

It is also objected that, even granting the virgin birth of Christ, such a birth would not give a sinless human nature to Christ, since by the laws of heredity the essential nature of the mother becomes also the nature of the child. But this objection is based on deeper knowledge of the secret workings of nature than we possess, and owes whatever strength there is in it to a one-sided emphasis on the power of sin and a minimizing of the preparatory power of the grace of the Eternal in the mother of our Lord and the creative power of the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of Life. The purifying grace of God in human nature does weaken the power of sin, and to the degree that it loses its dominion over the flesh, and its enticing influence over the spirit, to that extent is its transmissive power weakened. Mary, above all others, had evidently been the special subject of the cleansing power of God. In her the purifying influence of the Holy Spirit had perfected its work to the degree that in the sight of the Holy God she had "found favor" and was accounted worthy above all others to become the vessel of God—the mother of the world's Redeemer. How deeply the cleansing, sin-destroying and sin-expelling power of divine grace may penetrate human nature we may not know; but if the redeemed of earth on the day of their death may enter the sinless heavens and, beholding the face of God, stand without rebuke in the white splendor of his holiness solely through the grace he has given them, it is not contrary to reason nor to the teaching of his revelation that, for his own divine purpose in the redemption of the race, he should do for a human being at a particular period of life what he

does for all who love him at the close of life. This will appeal to the critic whether rationalist or evangelical.

The mother of our Lord was "found with child" before she knew man. There was here no concupiscence of the flesh, no unholy disturbing influence, the "power of the Highest overshadowed" her; as that same power—the life-creating Spirit—brooded over chaos in the beginning and impregnated the universe with the seeds of life. The "holy thing" thus begotten was the product of God's power, not man's; "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God." By this divine power, plus a divinely-prepared medium, the current of hereditary sin is stayed and a human nature, as that nature was before the Fall—the true nature of man—became the nature of him who came into the world to redeem the world, the head of a new race, the second Adam.

We see, then, in this condensed outline of a great theme, that there seems to be in the nature of things a moral necessity for the virgin birth of our Lord; that only by such a mode of entrance in human life are all requirements met. It is not a little remarkable that the moral conditions of the Incarnation, as a Christian thinker may work them out in the light of the teachings of the New Testament outside the gospels, find historical confirmation in the narratives of the birth of Christ in those gospels. To assume, then, that no such thoughts on the Christ entered the mind of New Testament writers, or to say that Paul, when writing of the preëxistent Christ, and of the sinless Christ, did not think of Christ in relation to inherited fallen nature when that same apostle speaks of him

as coming "in the *likeness* of sinful flesh," is to assume without the shadow of evidence that these thoughtful men, dealing with the mightiest personality that ever trod the green velvet of God, blindly failed to note, were stolidly oblivious to, the immeasurable difference between the Christ they saw and the human mass about them. This is not believable. Their own writings prove the contrary, and we are therefore justified in the conclusion that, in the minds of the New Testament writers, the virgin birth is a necessary presupposition, and that, therefore, the argument from silence is without support.

CHAPTER VII

Wendt's Theory of Ethical Union

The theory of the person of Christ adopted by Professor Hans Wendt in his notable work, *The Teaching of Jesus,* is on the whole all of a piece with the conceptions of Beyschlag, Oscar Holtzman, Harnack, and others who do not accept the essential deity of our Lord. According to Wendt, the relation between Christ and God was an ethical, a filial relation only. The theory is not worked out systematically by Wendt but lies scattered throughout the two volumes of the English translation of his work, *Die Lehre Jesu.* In the second volume, however, p. 163, he states his views more definitely, perhaps, than elsewhere. "In the Johannine utterances of Jesus," he says, "which we have above collected in regard to his relation to God, we can only find an expression of his strong religious consciousness that *during his earthly life, in spite of his existence under human and creaturely conditions, he stood in a continual inward fellowship of love with God to which he attributed the highest truth and the highest value, and which he felt to have direct and fundamental connection with his Messianic calling.*"

Now this theory of a spiritual union only, an ethical sonship between Christ and the Father and not a oneness of nature, is presented by Wendt on the ground that a union of two natures, the human and the divine, in one person is beyond all comprehension and is not

translatable into clear thought. But this substitute of Wendt's is not in reality a theory of incarnation at all, but a substitution for it of a divine *inhabitation,* an idea which was not foreign to the thought of the apostolic age, and which, if preached, would have awakened no opposition in Jew or Gentile. But even the supposition that there must necessarily be two consciousnesses in the one person if there are two natures, the divine consciousness and the human consciousness, if the divine nature is truly divine and the human is truly human, cannot be accepted on the mere statement of it. Nevertheless there is difficulty here with which we must reckon, and this difficulty which reason experiences in attempting to form any clear notion of a double consciousness in one person is sufficiently great to alienate many from belief in the essential divinity of our Lord, for it seems not only utterly inexplicable in itself, but it appears also, at the same time, to be wholly destructive of our ideas of personality.

But to think clearly of a human consciousness and a divine consciousness in the one person is not the only difficulty. There is another. If the Logos in Christ is a conscious Ego, and at the same time consciously participates with the eternal Father in the maintenance and government of the universe, we find ourselves face to face with another difficulty equally impossible to picture in clear thought; that is, upon the purely divine side, a double consciousness in the nature of the Logos himself—a consciousness of his limitations inherent in the conditions of his Incarnation, and at the same time a consciousness of his illimitable power and knowledge with the Father in the maintenance of all worlds, seen

and unseen. Christ, for instance, calms the furious gale which sweeps over the sea of Galilee. This is done by his inherent divine power. But how can the Logos, participating with the Father in all cosmic functions, be willing—that is, set in motion forces or energies that produce a storm while this same Logos in Christ Jesus is exercising his power in an opposite direction, quieting the storm? Can the divine will act in two opposing directions at one and the same moment? Other examples may be taken from many other miracles of the Lord, and the inability of the human intellect to solve such difficulties leads a certain class of thinkers to wholly deny that Jesus possessed consciousness of essential deity—that a conscious God was in him or united with him, making one person.

But, on reflection, it will be seen that in this mystery of the Incarnation no greater difficulty confronts the human reason than is clearly discernible in God's revelations of himself as recorded in the Scriptures, leaving out the Incarnation altogether. The manifestation of God to Moses in the burning bush is a case in point. Fire burns, and dry thorn bushes are combustible, but here the blaze does not cease, nor is the bush consumed. Is God, the Upholder, conscious of his power operating in two distinctly contrary and opposing directions at the same time? To include all in one word, How is any miracle possible? since it seems to involve a double consciousness in the Being of God at that moment. Nor, taking the side of the agnostic, or the atheist, or the rationalist, do we help ourselves in the least if we deny all miracles and set

aside all theophanies as purely imaginary. Pushing the Bible away does not set the universe aside. It stays; and all of its mysterious phenomena, those ever-challenging, tantalizing interrogation points, still confront us. All phenomena may be classed under two contrary and opposing heads. All forces which make for construction and permanency are opposed by forces which make for instability and destruction. Life and death, growth and decay, are ever at war, one against the other. But the laws of the universe are not ontological entities. They do not exist of themselves apart from a law-maker. They are the expression of an intelligent and infinite Will. Now, can we present clearly to rational thought this will creating and sustaining contrary and opposing forces at the same moment, the same instant of time? If we think of the Infinite willing a movement of matter in space we cannot think of him as not willing it, or, which is the same in principle, of retarding that movement and at the same moment initiating or increasing it. One act of the will, to our thought, renders impossible a contrary act at the same time. And yet there is nothing more common in the universe than the operation of opposites at the same moment. Centrifugal and centripetal forces never act the one without the other, nor, assuming the existence of both, can we by any possibility conceive of such action. The instant we conceive the operation of one, that instant the energy of the other is exercised also. If, then, God is the Creator and Sustainer of all things, upholding all things by the word of his power, and if the operation of forces in the uni-

verse has its primal impulse in his omnipotent will, has God a double consciousness in willing the simultaneous operation of these opposing laws and forces? Attraction and repulsion are not the same, they are antagonistic, but each must be held in existence, so to speak, ultimately by the will of God, and God must be conscious of each, and of the opposing energy of each at the same moment. Is this a double consciousness?

It may be contended, first, that the act of the divine will creating or sustaining two opposing forces does not constitute double consciousness any more than a determination of the will to bring the hands together argues a double consciousness, two Egos, two persons in the one human person; and, secondly, that there is in reality no analogy between the double consciousness in the incarnate Lord affirmed by the German theologian Wendt and this apparent twofold consciousness in God, since knowledge is not consciousness, and therefore God's knowledge of forces moving in opposite directions cannot constitute, nor be confused with, double consciousness.

We do not intend to insist upon the reality of a double consciousness in God, but only to point out that in the divine nature itself, as *we see* its manifestations in the Cosmos, there is that which suggests a double consciousness, and that we do not escape the problem of a so-called double consciousness by denying the essential divinity of Jesus as set forth in the gospels, if this willing two antagonistic principles or forces at the same instant is, or implies, a double consciousness.

With reference, then, to the first contention above we may observe that, however plausible it may seem

as a demonstration that two opposing forces may result from one act of the will, yet on closer reflection it will be seen that it is really no valid objection at all, since as a matter of fact the will in this case is simply willing one act and not two opposing acts; that is, it does not will that the hands shall be brought together and not brought together at one and the same instant; and as regards the *second,* there is no possible comparison between God in the midst of his universe and a man observing that universe.[1] The man is creating nothing, upholding nothing, moving nothing. He is conscious only of the knowledge of what he sees. But God is the primal, the ultimate force from which all forces radiate. He is the ground, the fundamental basis upon which all creation rests; the mover of every planet and every blazing sun in its orbit and of the motion of every atom in every world. Not one of them moves, whether planet or atom or ion, without his will and power. He wills all laws and sustains all things by the word of his infinite might. He is therefore conscious of the outgoing of his power in contrary directions, of two seemingly antagonistic acts of will at the same moment, and does therefore *appear* to possess a double consciousness; since he cannot, in any way conceivable to us, will and perform two opposing acts at the same instant and at that instant be equally conscious of both determinations. This we see in the operation of centrifugal and centripetal forces, and in the working of the laws of growth

[1] "From Thy will stream the worlds, life, and nature, Thy dread Sabaoth:
I will ?—the mere atoms despise me!"
—Browning's *Saul.*

and decay. We do not, we repeat, affirm a double consciousness, a dualism, in the divine Being, but that such appears to be so from the phenomena about us, both moral and physical. We may say that God is not *personally* in the universe, but is present only in knowledge and exercise of omnipotence. This does not affect the above view at all, since it is based not upon where God is but upon what God is conscious of in the outgoing of his infinite energy. The contradictions in the universe and the profound mysteries, leading back to the Infinite Mystery, which confront us in every science suggest forcibly that there may be depths beyond depths in the study of being which we may never sound. And we cannot dogmatically affirm what may or may not be the full powers of spirit—much less of an infinite Spirit.

But, however the foregoing may be, the Christian certainly can find no objection to what may appear to be a double consciousness in the Lord Jesus while here on earth that does not lie with equal force against that consciousness in the Lord in heaven. If Christ was not God incarnate here he is not God incarnate there. If he was only finite here he is only finite there. If he had not essential God-consciousness here he cannot have it there. All prayer and intercession addressed to him is therefore of none effect as to him; since, not being God, and therefore being finite, he cannot hear and know, as only an infinite and omnipresent being can know, all the prayers that ascend to him from the countless millions of earth, nor the moral states and spiritual needs of those who appeal to him. He is no longer the Christ of the New Testament nor the Christ

that fits in with the needs of the soul. It is as if one should pray to Peter, or to Paul, or Saint Catherine of Sienna, or to any of the saints in the Roman Calendar. God the Father knows his creation, and hears and answers prayer because his knowledge and power are infinite and his consciousness is also infinite. But if Christ who ascended from Olivet has not this God-consciousness and power then he cannot equal God in this knowledge of creation, of men, or of the thoughts and intents of the heart, or of the sighing and aspirations of those who lift to him their hands in beseeching prayer.

God is one. That is, whatever is in God universally is in him locally. If, then, this quality or power of double consciousness is in God, and God was in Christ, it is not surprising, but just what we should expect, that Christ being God should manifest this quality of God; and therefore in the stilling of the storm we see no more contradictory operation of divine consciousness and power than is manifested by the omnipresent God throughout the universe in the operation of natural law.

But is there in reality a double consciousness in the God-man Christ Jesus? If Christ in reality possessed a truly human nature we cannot deny him a truly human consciousness; and if he had also a truly divine nature he must have had a truly divine consciousness. Consciousness cannot be denied to either nature, for then we shall have not either nature in reality at all, but only something which resembles it. The difficulty to the logical reason is how to avoid this double—these two consciousnesses in the man Christ Jesus.

It will be observed that the difficulty is not understated. There is a deep mystery here, the mystery of personality. Was the human nature of Christ personal or impersonal? Human reason demands a conclusion, and it is in harmony with its nature that it should reach a conclusion and rest in it, but neither the human nor the divine nature of the Christ must be sacrificed on the altar of reason. The reason of today may not be the reason of tomorrow, nor of the day after; for when men speak of reason they often mean only knowledge, which is altogether another matter.

Our Lord had a truly human body, for he partook of *flesh and blood.* He also had a human soul, the seat of the emotions. His soul was *exceeding sorrowful, even unto death,* John 12. 27. He also possessed a human will, and this will he held ever subject to the will of the Father. *Not my will, but thine be done.* He also had a real human spirit. The gospels tell us that he *sighed in spirit, waxed strong in spirit,* and he commends *his spirit to the Father.* How then, possessing body, soul, and spirit, can the human nature of our Lord be declared impersonal? Here is a person and in him there must be personality. The Rev. Mr. Ottley, in his really valuable work on the Incarnation, attempts to furnish an answer to this profound mystery. "It will be said," he writes, "that this doctrine is unintelligible and self-contradictory; that will is inconceivable apart from personality, and manhood incomplete; but the answer is that in some way it expresses facts of Christian consciousness which lie beyond analysis, nor can it be said to do violence to the profound mystery which encompasses the

whole subject of personality." Such an answer only expresses the inability of the human intellect to fathom the depths of the Incarnation. And yet possibly a much better answer is that the human nature of Jesus, his spirit, soul, and body, never had a moment's existence separate and distinct from the uncreated Logos. The instant the spirit of the being Jesus existed it existed with the Logos, and not independent of him; so that, whatever may be the demands of thought, *in fact* there never was an independent personality of the human Jesus apart from the Logos, for the reason that there never was solely and only a human Jesus, but always a God-human being, a being not wholly and only God nor wholly and only man, but a union of the two natures in one God-man. The self-consciousness of Jesus always is that he is one, and not two. He knows himself to be a divine-human personality. Further study of this sublime mystery, while it may not eventuate in a full and satisfactory solution to all minds, may nevertheless afford solid footing for faith even where we cannot prove.

In all attempts to extend the boundaries of science it is always a safe method to proceed from what we know, step by step, to what we do not know. And since we have in this instance to study the nature of a consciousness which we cannot interrogate we are driven to a study of our spiritual selves. And here consideration of our self-consciousness may detain us a moment and throw some light possibly on the fact that our ignorance of how two consciousnesses can be in the one person does not necessarily render such an apparent contradiction an utter impossibility. That

two consciousnesses, two Egos, each conscious of itself and each possessing and living, apart from the other, its own separate and distinct life, can ever be conceived as *one* consciousness, *one* Ego, is not possible. And yet it is possible to conceive of two Egos having such a common ground that neither will be conscious of itself as distinct from the other, or without being at the same time conscious of the other. We may contemplate, for illustration, the ever-recurring philosophic problem how in consciousness one can be the knower and the known, the subject and the object, at one and the same time. If I am conscious of myself as the object of my consciousness, or the thing that is known, I cannot be conscious at the same time of myself as subject; since at that instant I think of myself only as object. And if I think of myself as subject, I cannot be at that moment conscious of myself as object. Here to pure thought is an apparent impossibility, and however impossible it may be, if one stops to think about it, how I can be conscious of a thing of which I am not conscious—that is, how I can be conscious of the subject when I am conscious only of the object—nevertheless I am conscious of myself both as subject and as object, the knower and the known at the same time, otherwise I would not be conscious at all. Yet how the mind can be conscious of both at one and the same time is the mystery.

Such problems do not indeed solve for us any difficulty in the Incarnation, but they do serve as suggestions, as faint hints, that there may be some such way, not of solving the mystery of a double consciousness, if there is such a thing, but of surmising that the fact

is not impossible. If we had the supposed double consciousness of the incarnate Lord it would be as natural to us as it was and is to him, it would be as natural to us as our present consciousness is, and would be no greater mystery than the above problem of the subject and the object *if the essential nature of the two were the same*. We may now approach the subject a little nearer.

Christian experience may throw some light upon this dark subject. Every one of us who has been born of God knows that God through the Holy Spirit holds communion with the souls of men. The spiritual man holds communion with God. He knows that between him and God there is a spiritual union, a union of friendship and love. He is conscious, and the closer he walks in loving intimacy with God the more certain grows his conviction, that a higher power than any power proceeding from man, even the power of God, has taken hold of his moral self and, strengthening will and intellect and feeling, has diffused spiritual energy into his life, making him other than he was. Everyone born of God is conscious of this experience. And yet no one is more conscious of this than the twice-born man is that, in the ordinary processes of his religious life, he cannot mark distinctly and surely the boundaries between himself in the field of his consciousness and the Spirit of God. In his deepest intuitions he cannot recognize distinctions between the impulses of the indwelling Spirit and the volitions of his own intellect. No line can he draw, either here or there, and with conscious certitude affirm—here God initiates, here I initiate; here is the ground whence

originates purely human intellection, and here the divine suggestion. Deeper than any plummet has sunk into the depths of the human spirit holy thoughts and aspirations float upward into the realm of consciousness and are there seized and appropriated as one's own, but so closely blended, so perfect, is the increasing union between the Spirit of God and the spirit of the saint that he cannot say other than with Paul, "I live; yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me." And yet, Paul is Paul. There are not two of him. There is no double consciousness. There are not two wills, but one will; for so blended are the two spirits, the Spirit of God and the spirit of man, that to the man there is but one consciousness, oneself, one personality. Now if such a spiritual union is possible between man and God it is not inconceivable, nor is it a contradiction in thought, that the divine nature should be so united with a perfectly holy human nature conceived by the divine Spirit, which at first brooded over the abyss of creation and impregnated the universe with life, that without the divine ceasing to be divine, or the human ceasing to be human, the result should be one personality, neither wholly and only God nor wholly and only man, but a union of both in one God-man.

But there are theories and theories. Some easily refute themselves, others lack the mental range of the time and fall harmless. There are others which exert a subtle influence and slowly but surely vitiate truth and finally contend with it in the open for supremacy as a practical force in life and conduct. It may be well therefore to call attention to another popular substitute for the teaching of the gospel.

CHAPTER VIII

Beyschlag's Theory of a God-filled Man

The danger at present, perhaps, is not from any widely-extended impression which the theories mentioned have upon our theological or religious thought, but rather from that interpretation of the Incarnation which, unable to invalidate the testimony of the gospels and the apostolic teaching, affirms the divinity of Christ and yet denies his essential deity. To most of us it seems like mental suicide to assert, except in figure, that one could be divine and yet not be really God. But it is not uncommon to find in the words of influential theologians the terms "Godhead," "God-manhood," applied to the nature of Christ and to the incarnation of God in him. He is declared to be the "second Adam"; the "Head of the race"; the "Mediator," and "Redeemer" of humanity, but he is not the eternal personal Word, the eternal Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, of the same essence as the Father, God of God, and, being the effulgence of his glory, the exact correspondence of his substance.

We may notice such a theory of the Incarnation. Beyschlag, for example in his *Life of Jesus*, affirms that Christ is the Son of God in an absolute sense; that in him in whom eternal love perfectly appeared there is essential Godhead, and that the self-consciousness of Jesus as to his divine Sonship was clear and absolute. He even declares in favor of the preëxist-

ence of Christ. Such a theory seems to measure up to the teachings of the gospels. Such affirmations of the personality of Christ present to us a being so exalted, at least verbally, that it seems useless to seek in Beyschlag's conception of him any real distinctions between him and God. Nevertheless in his *New Testament Theology* Beyschlag teaches that "with all the sublimity and uniqueness of his consciousness of Sonship Jesus felt and confessed that he was a man in God's presence." "He repeatedly calls God his Lord, and acknowledges the universal human obligation of praying to him, expressions which cannot possibly be harmonized with a consciousness of being God himself." With reference to the testimony of Jesus concerning himself he says, "When Jesus says of himself as the Son of God that the Father has sent or given him to the world; has intrusted him with this or that office or work; that the Father loves him and shows him all things; that he leaves him not alone, but will glorify him—all that does not go beyond the idea of the favorite and chosen among the children of men whom God has intrusted with this highest mission."

On the preëxistence of Christ Beyschlag cites the four principal passages in John's gospel, 6. 62; 8. 58; 17. 4, 5, 24, which teach that doctrine as plainly as human language can express any idea, and then explains away their obvious meaning in the following manner: "Principally on these passages, taken in connection with the prologue of the gospel, and with other traits of the Johannine discourses to which we shall yet come, is based the conception that Jesus, according to John, knows himself to be the personal Logos or

eternal Son of God, who, before he came incarnate into the world, lived in heavenly glory with the Father, and brought into the world with him the memory of that pretemporal and superhuman existence. But is not that to use the trinitarian notions of the fourth and fifth centuries, which are certainly unknown to the New Testament?"[1]

This is certainly a naive method of reasoning. The real question is not whether the General Councils of Nice and Chalcedon held "trinitarian notions," but, How did these words of Jesus, which Beyschlag endeavors to explain away, come to be understood, both by the Jews who heard him and took up stones to stone because he made himself the Son of God and by his immediate disciples, as teaching the very doctrine which Beyschlag denies? The fourth and fifth centuries did not read their "trinitarian notions" into John's gospel, but, on the contrary, derived from that gospel their declarations of the eternal personality of the Logos. The contemporaries of Christ understood him, and to them there was no ambiguity in his words; nor did he fail to understand them when they accused him of blasphemy.

Thus it is when we probe into the real meaning of Beyschlag, and endeavor to apprehend the clean, naked truth lying back of his declaration, we perceive how far short they fall of the loftier teachings of the New Testament. According to the first interpreters of Jesus, he had a real, conscious, personal existence in the Godhead from eternity. He is the eternal Son,

[1] *Bib. Theol.*, Eng. trans., vol. i, 251; German edition, vol. i, s. 247; compare Wendt, *Teaching*, vol. ii, p. 169.

participating in the divine life. But the preëxistent Christ of Beyschlag is a preëxistent notion, an eternal dream, an *Ebenbild,* the impersonal idea of ideal humanity floating in the thought of God. It is not God. It is not God any more than the idea of time, of space, of creation, of humanity itself, eternally existing in the consciousness of God, is God. It is an unconscious ideal, an impersonal product of the eternal mind but not the eternal conscious Logos, the alter-self of the everlasting Father, "by whom and through whom and for whom are all things." Christ *is* the archetypal Man, he *is* the divine ideal, the ground principle of all creation, the eternal image to which the humanity in the mind of God is to be conformed, and our Christian thought and whole ethical life would be impoverished beyond measure should that scriptural concept and presentation be dropped out of our thinking or lose its potency in the development of Christian character. But, on the other hand, there would be no Christian life at all to be impoverished if Christ was nothing more than an impersonal idea. For it is only on the idea of personality of Christ that we embrace the idea of the self-communication of God to humanity. The preëxistence of Christ in and of itself has no lasting interest, no value for us, unless it is the predicate of a personality which enters our existence as God incarnate.

Again, if such theories of the Incarnation are rejected as unreal, as nothing more than the embodiment of an idea and do not give us the very God himself, we cannot accept other, and perhaps lower, theories which present Christ as the *God-filled* man, the Man unique,

in whom the God-consciousness finds its perfect expression. The theory of Christ as the God-filled man, a being in whom God is perfectly manifested, is simple, easily comprehended, and makes little draft on indolent faith. But let us not be deceived. Stripped of the verbal glamour which surrounds it, and which commends it to sentiment, what have we in the final analysis but a *man,* a human being only, to whose personality the divine element is superadded? If Christ is this, and nothing more, in what sense, then, is the incarnation different from the indwelling of God as eternal righteousness in the souls of all good men, in every age and in every clime, who have come into ethical relation with him? By his affinity with God Jesus has revealed the spiritual capacity of man. This revelation is a distinct contribution to religion. In him we see the sunlit heights to which humanity, leaving the mist and darkness, may climb, the infinite sweep, the *umschwung,* of moral perfection to which the soaring soul may aspire. Then, given God as a Spirit and man as a spirit, each seeking the other, what is there to prevent such a union of both—the larger filling or ensphering the less, the Infinite infolding the finite; that the human may not be God-filled even as Christ was; that in this human also the God consciousness may not come to its fullest expression, and this human thus become the incarnate manifestation of God as was Jesus the Christ, whom, in opposition to all such vagaries, the apostle declares to be "the only begotten of the Father"? No! the oneness with God which the gospels predicate of Christ is, as Dr. Martineau recognizes, "not that resembling reflex of the

divine thought and character which men and angels may attain, but identity of essence, constituting him not Godlike, but God!"

But we have not done with this theory. As a substitute for the church doctrine of the Incarnation we may ask, What advantage, after all, does it really possess over the belief of the Church? From what difficulty does it free us that is less burdensome than the difficulties which it originates? Before us there rises in surpassing moral grandeur this God-filled man. But how shall we account for the man? What environment, what mighty personalities, what religious education, what spiritual power so played upon all the powers and potencies of his being that he alone of all men could be so God-filled; that he could become the perfect organ for the manifestation of the moral attributes of God, the perfect revelation of eternal Love?

Is it not passing strange that, among all who have ever appeared on earth, Jesus Christ alone should present a perfect character; that it is not possible to conceive of a moral excellence which his life did not manifest; that we cannot even think of God as superior in moral quality to him who said, "He that seeth me seeth the Father"; that therefore we only know God in any clear, satisfying way as we behold him in the face of Jesus Christ, and that until this "God-filled man" appeared humanity had no true conception of the eternal Father? Is not all this very remarkable? And yet, if he was only a God-filled *man*, how shall we account for the man?

Look, nay, gaze, as if eagerly desiring the possession of the qualities which shine in him with peerless

luster, at the wholeness, the universality, the marvelous completeness of character which is seen in him, and in him alone. Sunbeams darting from the sun do not contain more perfectly blended within their radiant lines the colors of the spectrum, nor does the rainbow arching the heavens more beautifully display the perfect harmony and glory of unraveled sunlight, than does the nature of Jesus show the symmetry, proportion, strength, and harmony of those heavenly virtues and fine spiritual qualities for which the human heart in its best moments yearns, for which the best and purest and noblest of the race have ever sought, and higher or more divine than which the human mind cannot conceive. With admiration and reverence we contemplate the characters of Francis of Assisi, Bernard of Clairvaux, of Wesley and Fletcher, of Payson and Edwards, of Fénélon and Augustine, saints of all churches and of all ages, and marvel at the heights of moral excellence they attained. What fasting and prayer, what self-denial, what dying to the world, what crucifixion of the flesh, what furnaces of purification, what agonies, and what triumphs of faith they passed through that they might attain unto the spiritual ideal which ever loomed before them and ever lured them on! Even at the close of his life Paul is still reaching out for yet greater victories. "Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." And yet the purest saint that ever bent the knee in adoration must have felt the incompleteness of his character, his lack

of symmetry and proportion, and, more than all, that the graces which adorned his life and made it beautiful were gifts from above of mercy and love. They were not his. Fragrant and lovely as flowers of paradise, these heavenly virtues grew in a soil watered by the dews of heaven, but they were not indigenous to the soil.

How different with Jesus. It is so natural for him to be holy that in the reading of his life we feel that in him all virtues and graces have their home. What gentleness, what sympathy, courage, optimism, faith, justice, mercy, and love blend their holy radiances in him! And yet each virtue in him is universal in its character and quality. He belongs to all men. The sympathy he showed for the multitude he concentrates on the spiritual needs of the poor sinner by the wayside well, and the love he gave those who loved him he manifested for those who outraged and insulted him and murdered him on a cross, when, done at last to death, he cried out for his murderers, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do!" Whom did Walt Whitman have in mind, or who is it that really answers to the man of universal qualities, in that poem of his, "The Answerer"?

"Then the mechanics take him for a mechanic
And the soldiers suppose him to be a soldier, and the sailors that he has followed the sea,
The authors take him for an author, and the artists for an artist;
And the laborers perceive that he would labor with them and love them;
No matter what the work is, that he is the one to follow it or has followed it;
No matter what the nation, that he finds his brothers and sisters there.

The English believe he comes of their English stock,
A Jew to the Jews he seems, a Russ to the Russ, usual and near, removed from none.
A gentleman of perfect blood acknowledges his perfect blood,
The insulter, the prostitute, the angry person, the beggar, see themselves in the ways of him, he strangely transmutes them.
They are not vile any more: they hardly know themselves they are so grown."

Well indeed may it be said of him that "there is nothing in the ideal which he offers which belongs to any particular age or class or nation—he stands above all, and unites all. That which was local or transitory in the circumstances under which he lived, in the controversies of rival sects, in the struggles of patriotism, in the isolation of religious pride, leaves no color in his character. All that is abiding, all that is human, is there without admixture in that eternal energy which man's heart can recognize in its time of trial."[1]

Modern historical methods may account, or think they do, for great reformers, military heroes, philosophers, and geniuses of history. What is the origin of this man?

"Given," as Henri A. Taine in his *Introduction to English Literature* tells us, "race, surroundings and epoch," we may account for the genius of the Luthers, the Loyolas, the Savonarolas, Mohammed, Confucius, Elijah, all the prophets and seers, poets, priests, and philosophers who have been thrown by the restless ocean of existence on the shores of time. But how, by any knowledge of "race, surroundings, and epoch," can we account for the Man, Jesus of Nazareth? Jesus is no more a Jew than he is the beauty-

[1] Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, p. 300.

loving Greek. In him we look in vain for the harshness, the fierce intolerance, the instinctive clannishness, the intellectual narrowness, characteristic of the Jew. The breadth of human sympathy, the calm unruffled poise, the winsome sweetness, the perfect idealism, the intellectual sweep and clearness, the wholesome bracing sanity—all the characteristic traits and fine "spiritual finish" baffle and confound us when by any known principle of evolution we seek to account for him as the product of his race. A tourist at the birthplace of Robert Burns, looking out on the picturesque wildness, the sad, subtle beauty of the Highlands, exclaimed, "Ah! it is no wonder Robert Burns was a poet." The guide at his side replied, "Sir, there have been many children born here since Robert Burns was born, but none of them was a poet." Environment does not create. Environment impresses, develops what is. Back of environment must be the man, the soul, the thing upon which impression is to be made; and that is the very thing we are trying here to discover. Other children were born under Syrian skies and played in the streets of Nazareth. Other children gazed on the splendid prospect of Carmel, the mountains of Shechem, of Gilboa, on Safed, which notched the rim of the horizon of Jesus in his early years; others in his day lived amid the contest of ideas, the revolutionary programs and passions, the antagonisms of brutal Roman and plotting Jew; in others the voices of the past, the voice of prophet and psalmist, of priest and seer, found an echo, and yet he only comes forth, the only one capable of becoming the organ of the supreme God! Out of

Nazareth, out of that boiling chaos of social antagonisms, of political and religious animosities, out of that epoch when religion was dead and God was lost, he alone emerges as the being who is to be the God-filled man, the organ of the Infinite. How can we account for him? Plato is of Greece; Cromwell is of England; Napoleon, Washington, Sakyi-Muni, Mohammed, Goethe, Shakespeare, Corneille—we can account for them all. Jesus created Paul and John and Athanasius and Augustine, Chrysostom, Saint Bernard, Luther, and Wesley, and if his name faded from the scroll of history they would all vanish with him; but who, what race, what environment, what epoch, what power or combination of powers, created *him?* Even Renan is compelled to say, "Whatever may be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will grow young without ceasing; his legend will call forth tears without end: his suffering will melt the noblest hearts; all ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there is none born greater than Jesus."

But what produced *him?* What produced the man who *could* become the only God-filled man—the unique and perfect manifestation of God in history; this man who stepped from the door of a carpenter's shop in Nazareth to the throne of the universe?

"This Godlike One,
Whom none did once convince of one small swerve
From perfectness: nor ever shall! So strong
The elements obeyed him; so divine
The devils worshiped; so with virtue charged
The touch of him was health; so masterful
The dead came back upon his call; so mild
The little children clustered at his knee,

> And nestled trustful locks on that kind breast
> Which leans to-day on God's—consider, sir!
> A human heart beat there! a human brain
> Pondered and pitied, and was sorrowful
> Behind that sovereign brow. The blood of us—
> Of women and men—coursed, crimson, warm,
> In those rich veins! Nay, and he ate our meats
> And drank our drinks, and wore the dress we wore;
> And his hair fluttered in the breeze which stirred
> Peter's and John's and mine."

> "'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for! my flesh that I seek
> In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
> A Face like my face that receives thee: a man like to me
> Thou shalt love and be loved by forever; a Hand like this hand
> Shall open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!"

This popular substitute, then, for a true Incarnation has difficulties of its own which investigation does not solve. We see that, when pressed for an answer, the theory itself utterly evaporates. It has no answer. No applied theory of evolution, so much relied upon to account for the great men of history, can account for this man. He was a mystery to his mother, to his brethren, to his neighbors, to his disciples, to the multitudes who hung upon his words, to his judges, to the chief priests and rulers of his people, to all the ages following; and he still remains the enigma of history. The only clue to his origin, the only answer that can ever account for him, when the critic, the historian, and the psychologist have failed, is that given in the gospels of Matthew and Luke: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

Again, we may be with men and study them as an entomologist may study his subject under the lens,

analyzing and dissecting them in all their moods and tenses, and yet never know them. Knowledge here is through affinity, mental and moral. Balzac, it is said, never portrayed the character of a pure woman, and Shakespeare never painted a saint. What we are determines our affinities, and these condition our knowledge.

The less can never more than shadow forth the greater. Neither Moses nor Elijah nor Isaiah, before whom the eternal glory swept in vision, could do more than in broken syllables utter what they saw. The essential life, the innermost character of the revealed Deity, the fathomless deep of the Infinite, was beyond them. Only a God can reveal a God. "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." (John 1. 18.) He only who is of the heart, of the nature and substance, of the Father can reveal the Father. Therefore in Christ alone, not as an incarnated idea, not as a God-filled man, but as the only begotten of the Father, as the incarnated personal Deity, has humanity at last a sight of God as the social God, the redeeming God, the pitiful God, the God of love, for "He that seeth me seeth him that sent me."

Into this life of ours the only begotten, the eternal Son, truly entered. He entered it subject to all its limitations, as truly human. He lived a human life, knowing its hardships, its loves and friendships, the love of home, of father and mother, of brothers and friends. He knew its burdens of poverty, its disappointments, its quiet days, its joys and tears, and at last entered the shadow of death, which engulfs us all,

that he might "show us the Father." It is this view of Christ, and this view alone, which transfigures the common life and

"Gives grandeur to the beating of the heart."

Finally, a correct view of the Incarnation safeguards a correct view of the Atonement. There is an infinite difference between the death of Christ as a martyrdom and that death as an atonement for humanity.[1] For how is atonement for humanity possible by anyone who is himself involved in the ruin of humanity? He may die for himself, but how can he die for all? And how can we know at first hand, without any shadow or possibility of doubt, that God is reconciled to sinful men by the death of anyone? We never can know it if, holding low views of the Incarnation, we eliminate from the person of Christ essential Deity. But in the light of the gospel we see the eternal Son, who is not involved in the sin of the world, assuming a human nature which, begotten by the race, and thus entering as the perfect man into the solidarity of the race, makes atonement for the race. He can atone for us, for he is one of us; bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh. "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels," but "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same," "wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people," Heb. 2. 14-17. This is the visible human side of it, and on

[1] *Lux Mundi; the Atonement.*

the other side, Paul, the great preacher of the Atonement, says it was God who was "in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself," 2 Cor. 5. 19. It is God *himself,* then, who reconciles us to himself; who thus gives us, *himself,* assurance of the reconciliation. It is God *himself* who has come to us in Christ and makes us "partakers of the divine nature." Wherefore the Church throughout the whole world sings in the *Te Deum,*

> Thou art the King of glory, O Christ!
> Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father!

And the redeemed in heaven, who discern in the Incarnation the unfolding of the dark problems of human history, cry out, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. . . . Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

CHAPTER IX

Jesus—The Master Teacher

But if we cannot account for Jesus the *Man* by any known law of development, how can we account for him, this spiritual Flower of Humanity, as the *Master Teacher* of Humanity? That he is the supreme teacher of civilized nations will not be questioned. That gradually his name and his teachings are becoming supreme everywhere in the Orient, in India, China, Japan, and other countries, will also not be questioned by those who are familiar with the work of foreign missions. While Jesus is being critically discussed by scholars of every grade and shade of belief in the intellectual centers of civilization his saving power is felt by the savages of Terra Del Fuego, as Darwin witnessed, by the Brahmins of India, and the inhabitants of the Arctic Zone. Mohammed, Buddha, and Confucius may be the religious teachers of more millions of humanity than Jesus, but on the thought of the world, on great historical movements, on world affairs in general, on the progress of science, education, law, government, they exert no influence whatever unless it be to make more difficult the education of the race. But Jesus is the guiding star of human progress, and the influence of his teaching which has passed into all laws and humane institutions and redeeming forces of the modern world was never so potent as it is today. That Jesus is recognized as the

Master Teacher must be admitted. Therefore the study of Jesus as a religious guide, must give pause to every thoughtful critic who truly comprehends what it means to become the one, sole authoritative Voice uttering the revelation of God to humanity, and by the regenerating power of his teaching and the vast uplifting influence of his life has changed the entire course of human history.

This is preëminently an intellectual age. All that ever came before it are but as candle dips to incandescent arcs. It is the age of exploration, of discovery, of invention, of progress, of adaptation of nature's unused power to man's needs and convenience. For freshness, vigor, and spontaneity no period can be likened to it, but the glow and enthusiasm of the Italian Renaissance. The boundaries of human knowledge have been pushed to wider limits and to such astounding results that the fictions of Jules Verne and the Arabian Nights have been transmuted into fact. The dreams of yesterday have become the realities of today. With instruments and methods, themselves marvels of scientific skill and adaptation to the purposes of research, the intellect of the age has discovered new principles, and with all the dominating idea of development conquers new worlds in astronomy, philosophy, history, biology, geology, and sociology and enters with confident steps the realms of ethics and religion. And yet after all, the everlasting Riddle of the Universe, the *What,* the *When,* the *Where,* the *Whence,* the *Why,* the *Whither,* still remains. The Sphinx still gazes on the infinite. In the modern brain every molecule is an interrogation point, but the

enigmas of Life still baffle us. They mock our instruments and methods and intellectual weaknesses while creating in us a thirst for knowledge that is insatiable, and fan the flames of a desire for dominion that is boundless. Thus through the ages man has climbed with bleeding feet the stony slopes of the mountain as if he would scale the heavens in his search for the secret of being, but only to find as he struggled upward to the summit still vaster skies and wider horizons.

Mystery still abides! Nature is mysterious. What is light? We dissect it and analyze it and measure its speed, knowing that in its flight from the sun to Sirius or Arcturus it will leave the whole solar system far behind in an hour, but have we found its essence when we have described it as a mode of molecular activity?

What is Energy? Leaving out God, what is the primal cause of energy? For the passage of light, magnetism, radiant heat, and other forces through space, science demands a medium filling the infinite void and propagating all disturbances and waves of light and heat. We see the color red when four hundred millions of millions of electrical waves in the ether each 256 ten-millionths of an inch in length beat on the eye in a second of time. It is the ether that carries the light and the heat; the ether in which all worlds swim, but of the nature of this ether we know nothing, or next to nothing.

What is electricity? What is life? We see its manifestations, we feel its subtle power. But what is it? The edge of the scalpel in the surgeon's hand has never found it; the chemist in his laboratory has never grasped it; "it flutters the fringe of its ethereal robe in

the eye of the microscope," but it is as invisible as spirit and its essence past finding out. No laws of physics, no biological laws can explain it. It looms before us the impenetrable, incomprehensible mystery. Then, again, "Knowest thou the balancing of the clouds?" "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion?" "Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season, or guide Arcturus with his sons?" What is gravity? Newton by its aid will explain the motions of the stars, but who will explain gravity? We do not uncover the nature of a force when we baptize it with a name. "Science," says Von Baer, "is in its source eternal, in its operation not limited by time and space; in its scope, immeasurable; in its problem, endless; in its goal, unattainable."

The whole creation is shrouded in mystery. An infinite moan, a heavy sigh as of infinite weariness heard by all who listen breaks from the heart of nature. All the sounds of the universe are pitched on a minor key. The roar of Niagaras, the thunder of the ocean breaking on a lonely shore, the rippling of the brooks, the sighing of the winds in the tree tops, all breathe forth an undertone of inexpressible pain. The mockery of the beautiful is not denied us. There is beauty in nature. There is a loveliness on the face of things so soft and fair, so pure and sweet that the human heart is melted in tenderness and love; the delicate grace of dappled dawns, the radiant splendors of noon, the burnished glory of crimson sunsets, and the awe-inspiring majesty of star-lit nights; but back of it all are the low, sad notes, the minor tones of the

Aeolian harp. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now . . . waiting for the manifestation [the unveiling] of the sons of God." Creation seems to be one great bloody crime. The very earth on which we live is the theater of ages of struggles, of suffering, and death. Earth is the sorrowful star, the home of death. Everywhere nature "red in tooth and claw" has her Gettysburgs and Chancellorvilles, her crimson fields of battle.

> "From carped cliff and quarried stone
> She cries 'A thousand types are gone
> I care for nothing, all shall go.'"

The strong prey upon the weak; and the strongest conquer the strong. To some the survival of the fittest is a premium on murder. Pain, disease, grief, sacrifice and blood track the path of progress, and without agony and the shedding of blood, without Gethsemane and Calvary, there is no advancement. Law, inexorable law, law blind, cruel, and remorseless, grinds on through millenniums and the reason for creation, the Purpose of the Ages, is hid from our eyes.

Nor is this all. Human life is a mystery, the profoundest mystery of all. What an unspeakable tragedy is life! What travesties of justice mock the human sense of right! "Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne"; self-complacent mediocrity in the seat of broad-browed genius; unctuous hypocrisy aping the devotions of piety; ill-gotten wealth crowding unsuccessful poverty to the wall; vice and crime stalking in the light of day, while modest virtue walks with apologetic air. The dreams of youth vanish in the struggle for existence; the

innocence of childhood is lost in the polluting mire of sin; the terrible law of vicarious suffering swoops down over all like a red-beaked vulture on its prey, and the awful tragedy goes on from generation to generation; sorrow, pain, disappointment, disease, and death evermore shadowing the human life, blighting the morning, darkening the noon, and deepening the night, when man worn and weary with life's fruitless struggle sits down at last amid the wrecks of the years disillusioned and dumfounded at the vision of the unreality of all beneath the stars!

Where are the faces of the long ago? Where are the loved ones whose memory still abides though the substance is gone? They went out one morning into the infinite, and though love, quenchless, defiant love, would climb the shadowy heights and cross the fields of the dim unknown for one more embrace of the hearts we cherish, we sit in the shadow of our grief and cry out "for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still."

"Behold we know not anything,
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last to all,
And every Winter change to Spring—
So runs my dream: but what am I?
An infant crying in the night,
An infant crying for the light,
And with no language but a cry."

But what light comes to us out of the shadows of the soul-life, what Voice sounds out here? Who is the one Teacher that can speak with authority on God, on Life, on Man and his destiny—with such authority that not only the savage and the uneducated mind of

decadent races, but the scientifically educated man of every clime and every age will accept it with reverence and obey its commands?

Four great teachers divide the world between them: Confucius, Gautama, Mohammed, and Jesus. For three thousand years the religion of Confucius has instilled in millions the virtues of sobriety, politeness, and family honor. But it is not a religion any more than the philosophy of Plato's *Republic,* Aristotle's or Herbert Spencer's *Ethics* or Comte's *Postivism* is a religion. It has no immortality, and it is lacking in a God. It is a sociology, but not a revelation. We learn nothing in it outside the earth-bound life. The dead hand of the past is upon the life of the present and upon no shadow of today does Confucius throw the light of tomorrow.

Gautama Buddha preached peace through self-abnegation. But in this man is effaced for the sake of the universe, the concrete is sacrificed on the altar of the abstract. Between the original thought of Gautama and the Christian doctrine of renunciation of a sensuous world, there appears at first a faint resemblance, but the practical outcome in the working of both shows the naturalness of Christianity and the unnaturalness of Buddhism.

Turn to Mohammedanism which contains, as Gibbon said, an eternal truth and a necessary fiction, that is, that there is one God and Mohammed is his prophet.

Mohammed established the religion of the sword. The unity of God, the virtues of temperance, justice, fortitude, and truthfulness stand out clearly in his teachings. But so do the doctrines of fatalism, while

the highest Christian virtues are wanting. As the historian Freeman shows, it has consecrated slavery, polygamy, and despotism.

These are the great teachers of the race. How do they compare with Jesus in the light of modern civilization and scientific thought? And where shall we place the saints and sages of these religions, and also the men of science, the fruitful thinkers of every age, in comparison with Jesus of Nazareth? Of all who ever delivered a message to the world, of all who ever inspired in high or low degree, whether prophets and priests of the nations, philosophers, or poets, or the teachers whom millions obey in the East in India, China, or Japan—far above them all—separate and distinct as heaven is from earth in antecedent and character and life and personality and message and influence and relation to humanity—far above them all towering like Mount Blanc from the valley of Chamouni, or like the coming of the sun through the gates of the morning when the stars fade away, there rises before us Jesus Christ the Master Teacher, the "Light of the World." But how can we account for him?

Some critics do not want to account for him. It is quite common to find in skeptical works paltry attempts to detract from the originality of Jesus. His teachings, we are told, are eclectic, the fruitage of Palestinian and Alexandrian thought; that many of his weightiest sayings may be paralleled by sentences almost identical in form from Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Socrates, Plato, Confucius, and Oriental teachers. This discovery is made much of, and even Christian thinkers will sometimes show ill-considered

zeal in their efforts to break its force. But why break its force? Why not accept it and rejoice in it? It would be something extraordinary if the self-revealing God—if the Eternal Logos, the "true light which lighteth every man coming into the world," who from the beginning at different times and in divers ways has endeavored to make known his will and saving power to all nations should not have succeeded in quickening the minds of thoughtful spirits in every land, inspiring them with spiritual ideals and instilling in them germs of eternal truth valid for all men and all times. Had there been more receptive souls of the type of Aurelius, Socrates, or Confucius—minds responsive to the Voice within them—there would have been more spiritual truth in the possession of humanity prior to the coming of Christ, more parallels to the sayings of Jesus in the teachings of the philosophers. This instead of detracting from the originality of Jesus would only have confirmed the universal validity of his teaching. The originality of Euclid is no less because Geometry is universally true.

But if the sayings of Jesus can be paralleled by the sayings of philosophers, can results be paralleled? Why is it that the wisdom of Jewish rabbis, the philosophy of Greek and Roman thinkers, the moral musings of Hindu or Chinese sages, have not produced results in human history which may be paralleled to those wrought by the teachings of Jesus? If the words are the same, why are not the results the same? In Rome there was an altar to pity, but Jesus raised an altar to pity in every heart that felt the warmth of his teachings. It was Jesus who softened the bar-

barity of Roman and Goth, who put an end to gladiatorial combat, who modified cruel laws, broke the shackles of the slave, became the inspirer of liberty, civil and religious, exalted woman, sanctified childhood, built hospitals, asylums, and orphanages, revealed God as a Father full of mercy and love; put hope and new life in the souls of men sunk in moral despair and self-condemnation; revealed the heinousness of sin and the marvelous beauty of holiness, and lifted the shadows of death and brought life and immortality to light through his gospel. Why have not other teachers accomplished similar results? Why this difference between the sayings of Jesus and the sayings of philosophers? The immeasurable difference is seen in the statement of Jesus Christ himself concerning his teaching, *"The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life."*

Jesus is the Authoritative Teacher. Those who heard him declared that he spoke as one having "authority." No other teacher, whether prophet or philosopher, has ever dared to set the seal of finality, of infallibility, upon his words. No one has ever presumed to set up the astounding claims for himself that Jesus did as the Way, the Truth, the Life. And if he did, who would care? Who today discusses the words of Mohammed? of Confucius? Who cares what Gautama taught? Jesus shares his place with no one. He alone is the Teacher of humanity. His religion is the only religion. He was not a philosopher dependent upon his skill in ratiocinative reasoning in the field of ethics for his influence over his disciples. He was not a mere religious genius possessing clearer

perceptions than other men of the spiritual nature of true worship. He was more, and is felt now by the most intellectual of this modern age to be more than all such inadequate, beggarly terms can possibly include. He never reasons, never appeals to the teachings of others to confirm his statements. He lays down the laws of his kingdom like God asserting the laws of Sinai, and he demands from all men absolute surrender to his doctrine. No one on earth ever demanded the loyalty of mortals that Jesus demanded, and no one but Jesus ever got it. And not only did this loyalty, this utter abandonment of self, even unto death, manifest itself among those who had seen him, and walked with him, but in every age since he ascended from Olivet, there have been those who not only accept his teachings as the saving power of their lives and as the sure revelation of God, but who have gladly offered up their lives to him as their supreme Lord.

Christ is the Universal Teacher. All others are local. They all manifest the limitations of their times. The tang of their native soil is upon them, and the stamp of their environment. Christ alone is cosmical. He belongs to no race, to no time, but to all races and to all ages. So close akin is he to Universal Man that every race and tribe of men think of him as one of themselves. He does not appear as a theological reformer like Mohammed, or Gautama, nor as a social philosopher like Confucius, but as the embodiment of Primal and Eternal Truth. He is adapted to all men. He is the same inspiring Teacher at the foot of the Himalayas as he is among the tribes of the

Arctic Circle. He opens windows in the soul of the African, the Hindu, and the Chinese as he does in the darkened mind of the materialist or agnostic in the intellectual centers of Europe or America. And everywhere he and he alone inspires in the human heart the hope of pardon and lights the flames of sane desire for the eternal beauty of holiness.

On her throne of unbiased judgment, says an English writer,[1] History calmly sits and utters the irrevocable decree assigning each to his own place whom the world calls great. Prophets and statesmen and leaders of nations, kings and emperors, poets and philosophers, artists and scientists, heroes and martyrs, all pass before her and take their seats laurel-crowned or pass to oblivion. They are not all great. History pulls down the mighty from their thrones and exalts the lowly. They were great in their day. Shouting multitudes sang their glory and burned incense to their names. But they have not stood the test of time. In the searchlight of historic criticism they shrivel to their true proportions. Socrates is remembered, but his murderers are forgotten. Nero condemns Paul, but the ages condemn Nero. Pilate condemns the Christ, but Christ challenges the ages and they bow before him. Savonarola and Huss and Latimer and Ridley are condemned by councils and conclaves, but impartial history reverses the verdict and crowns them as the pioneers of the better day. Thus it is with the Christ as the Universal Teacher. He comes at last to his own as the one Name which is above every name, the one Universal Teacher, who,

[1] *Witness of the Heart to Christ.*—Boyd Carpenter.

as Theodore Parker said, "pours out a doctrine beautiful as the light, sublime as heaven, and true as God."

Other teachers have added nothing to his teaching. Since Christ spoke others have spoken. But have they added one Beatitude to the Sermon on the Mount, or discovered a single virtue different in kind from those exalted by Christ? With all our intellectual equipment and with all the intellectual and religious inheritance of the past we can neither discover nor invent any moral truth concerning God and the duties we owe to him, to ourselves, to our fellow beings, to the state, to the family, or concerning the future which he has not already proclaimed, nor can we hold up to men higher and holier ideals than the Christ himself who, while unapproachable in his moral excellence and purity, still inspires the holiest to alpine heights of moral perfection in him.

Again, *the world never outgrows the teaching of Jesus.* This, to the thoughtful mind, is an astounding fact in the history of the intellectual development of the race, for

> "The thoughts of men are widened
> With the process of the suns."

And of no other teacher the world has ever seen can this be said. We outgrow them all in whole or in part. The thinkers of yesterday are superseded by those of tomorrow. Descartes is followed by Malebranche, Spinoza, and Leibnitz. The Scotch philosopher, Reid, attacks the vagaries of Berkeley and Hume. Immanuel Kant starts a revolution which sweeps away all previous systems of thought. Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, Lotze, Comte, Ulrich, Mill, Spencer, and a host

of others demonstrate, each to his own satisfaction, the superiority of his own philosophy. McCosh goes beyond Reid and Hamilton in realism, and Herbart, the German realist, criticizes Fichte and Schelling and discards the idealism of Kant. In anthropology, geology, astronomy, and physics there is the same struggle for truth and the same passing of great names of yesterday making room for greater ones tomorrow.

As Professor Orr shows[1] our modern thinkers destroy each other. "Strauss attacks Hartman's *Pessimism,* but Hartman says Strauss 'has no philosophic head.' Herbert Spencer ridicules Frederic Harrison's *Postivism,* and Harrison retorts on Spencer's *Doctrine of the Unknowable* as an 'ever present conundrum to be everlastingly given up.' Huxley attacks Harrison and is attacked in return. S. Laing, author of *Modern Science and Modern Thought,* says the old creeds are dead and tries to make a new one, whereupon Professor Huxley says when he came to that he shut the book. Mr. Greg assails the New Testament and yet wants to get out of it a guide of life, but Francis Newman comes along and says to sit in judgment on Jesus of Nazareth and convict him of glaring errors as a first step, and then, as a second, set him on a pedestal to glorify him as the most divine of men and the sublimest of teachers, a perpetual miracle—is a very lame and inconsequent proceeding." Thus the modern thinkers of Anti-Christian thought devour one another. And thus all great names fade.

But the name of Jesus stays. The greater the in-

[1] *Christian View of the World.*

tellectual advance of humanity, the farther beyond us stretch away the heavens of his teaching, as when one ascends the mountain peak and finds his sky line vaster. The advancement of physical science is the death of the religions of India; the progress of civilization is the annihilation of Mohammedanism, for neither slavery nor polygamy nor despotism, the three cardinal vices which war against the individual, society, and free government, can exist where once modern ideas take root in the thought-life of a people. But the teachings of Jesus not only adapt themselves to modern progress, they themselves are the very forces which direct the tendencies of thought; they, and they alone, give value and dignity and meaning to the efforts of men, and where the power and influence of these teachings are wanting there progress is wanting. As a profound thinker among us has observed, there is no social question in Turkey or Egypt. But Socialists the world over and the millions of toilers are beginning to see the Christ, not as Renan viewed him, a "Socialist with a Galilean coloring," but as the Master Teacher who alone in an age of mass meetings, combinations, democracies, and strikes can inspire modern politics with higher aims than the hopes of the demagogue and the selfish ends of industrial kings. His thought is vaster than the thoughts of the world rulers, world teachers, agitators, theorists, and philosophers. He is the leader of the orchestra. The air is full of discordant sounds. Each musician, says Professor Peabody of Harvard,[1] is tuning his own instrument and practicing his own part. But in him is the har-

[1] *Jesus Christ and the Social Question.*

mony, the rhythm of the whole, and when he appears the discord dies and the symphony begins.

What puzzles thoughtful men is the modernity, the present day tone of the teachings of Jesus. One would think him living in the intellectual climate of our modern scientists and philosophers. "It is little less than marvelous," says a thoughtful writer, "the way in which the words of Jesus fit in with the forms of thought which are today current. They are life, generation, survival of the fit, perishing of the unfit, tree and fruit, multiplication by cell growth as yeast, operation by chemical contact as salt, dying of the lonely seed to produce much fruit, imposition of a higher form of life upon a lower by being born from above, grafting a new scion upon a wild stock, the phenomena of plant growth from the seed through the blade, the ear and the matured grain, and finally, the attainment of an individual life which has an eternal quality."[1]

The teachings of Jesus are for every age. "Try him," says Theodore Parker, "try him as we try other teachers. They deliver their word: find a few waiting for the consolation, who accept the new tidings, follow the new method, and soon go beyond their teacher, though less mighty minds than he. Such is the case with each founder of a school of philosophy, each sect in religion. . . . But eighteen centuries have passed since the tide of humanity rose so high in Jesus. What man, what sect, what church, has mastered his thought, comprehended his method, and so fully applied it to life?"

[1] McConnell, *Evolution of Immortality.*

We are well aware that here and there it is said the teachings of Jesus are impractical in our modern life. But which of these teachings shall we eliminate for the benefit of the race and the comfort of the individual? Christ says, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." Shall we eliminate that? No! say the spotless souls who wear the white flower of a blameless life; no! says the man blackened and marred by the years; no! says even the sensualist and the debauchee, for if there is a God at all we know that only the pure in heart can see him. Christ says, "Blessed are the meek." Shall we destroy that? No! cry the oppressed and lowly in every land, for then you will put the Neros, the Napoleons, the gods of force and cruelty on the throne of the world. Again, which of the Christ teachings concerning the family, the relations between the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, man and his fellow, government and social duties, shall we eliminate? And when he speaks to us of the life beyond, when he tells us with holy joy and with the clarion note of triumph in his voice that "they that do righteousness shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of my Father," shall we declare all such teaching incompatible with our modern life? We may blot out these teachings from the life and hope of the toiling millions, but it will be at the peril of all for which civilization stands, and of which it is the fruit and blossom, for when you rob men of the heavens they will claim the earth.

In a larger and profounder sense than can be affirmed of the teachings of any other, *the teachings of*

Jesus are adapted to the soul, the spiritual nature of man. The peculiar relation which these two, the spirit of man and the teachings of Christ, bear the one to the other, is proof sufficient that they were intended for each other; they fit.

The universe is not swung on half-hinges. Wherever there is a fin, there is water; wherever there is a wing, there is supporting air; wherever there is an eye, there is the light. Between the water and the fin, the air and the wing, the light and the eye, there is a fitness, a correspondence which demonstrates intention, intelligent purpose, and back of that purpose is the mind of the Infinite which made both the water and the fin, the marvelous eye and the beautiful light. Between man's body and the physical universe about him, there is a correspondence, a unique and perfectly adjusted relationship which leaves no doubt that man was intended for the earth and the earth for man.

But what corresponds to the soul of man? What is it in all the expanding circle of nature that fits into, that is perfectly related to the needs, to the aspirations, to the possibilities of the human soul? Look into that vast, unbottomed abyss of the soul. Behold the majesty and sweep of its powers. With what God-like superiority over nature is it conscious? How strong and glorious it is! And yet what hunger consumes it? What Titanic struggles, what pitiful yearnings, what agonies, what sorrows, keep it forever restless, heaving and tossing like the waves of the sea. In the soul of man there is a capacity for God and immortality. In the unfathomed depths of every man's heart there is a cry for the living God, muffled

though it may be by the din and roar of carnal strife and the babel of the world. There is a cry for deliverance from the bondage, the guilt and gravitating power of sin, a hunger for righteousness, a dumb inarticulate yearning for the realization of an ideal that is ever eluding his grasp. What can satisfy this soul of man? What can assure him of a life beyond? What answers to these gropings after God and reveals him as he is not revealed in the starry heavens and the round green earth? What is it that leads this soul of man with all its wondrous powers and capabilities from the lower circles of the nethermost hells up to the "enormous hills" of God, to worlds of light and beauty filled with melodious voices of redemption and peace? Aye, and when the day is gone and the shadows of evening are stretched out; when also the dear sweet ones who have lived in the innermost shrine of our human love are laid in the tongueless silence of the grave—what is it then that comforts the broken heart and brightens the gloom with visions of fellowship in glory,

"When from the East the eternal morning moves"?

What is it that corresponds thus, that fits into every nook and corner, every mood and tense, every hope and fear, with every plaintive cry, and every victorious shout in this mighty soul of man? Search creation round, test all religions, try all literatures, ransack the ages, and there is at last but one answer—the words of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Master Teacher! But how can we account for him?

CHAPTER X

The Kenosis

But how could the infinite and eternal enter temporal and spatial relations and become man? This is the problem of problems. Heretofore we have stood in the outer court of this mystery, a mystery which the angels of God may not fathom, and if we would dare to take another step we must enter the very holy of holies. How did God become man? To this the apostle in his epistle to the Philippians gives us a clue, He does not attempt a solution of the problem, nor does he furnish an answer to the many questions to which his own statement gives rise. But he reveals to us a fact not found in the writings of any other New Testament writer, a fact which reveals to us the method of God for the restoration of the race and the ground principle, the fundamental law, underlying and absolutely essential to the intellectual, the social, the political, and the spiritual development of humanity. Writing to the Philippians he says, "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who, subsisting originally in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be equal with God: but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

The first thought which arrests our attention is that

"he emptied himself." But of what did the preëxistent Christ, eternally existing in the "form of God," empty himself? It is not necessary to restate the many theories which earnest and devout minds have suggested in answer to this question. Meyer,[1] for example, writes: "What the divine Logos laid aside in the Incarnation was the form of God; the divine glory, as a form of existence; but not his equality with God, which constituted and was essential to his nature. This he retained, and to this belonged essentially and necessarily the divine self-consciousness, and in the Incarnation consequently the divine-human self-consciousness."

Ellicott[2]: "Of what did He empty himself? Not exactly of the μορφὴ θεοῦ . . . but of that which he had *in* that form, that Godlike majesty and visible glory which he had from all eternity."

Alford[3]: "He emptied himself of the μορφὴ θεοῦ—not his *essential* glory, but its manifested possession . . . the glory which he had with the Father before the world began (John 17. 5) and which he resumed at his glorification. He ceased while in this state of examination to reflect the glory which he had with the Father."

Lightfoot[4]: " 'He divested himself,' not of his divine

[1] *Com. Philipper* 88. 87. "Was der göttliche Logos bei der Menschwordung ablegte, war nach u. St. die μορφὴ θεοῦ d. i. die göttliche δοξα als Existenz form, nicht aber das seine Natur wesentlich und notwendig ausmachende εἶναι ἴσα θεοῦ welches er beheilt, und Zu welchem eben so wesentlich und nothwendig das göttliche, mittin im Menschgewordenen das gottmenschliche selbst-bewusstein gehörte."

[2] *Com. on Philippians.*

[3] *Greek Test.*, vol. iii, 168.

[4] *Com. Philippians*, p. 110.

nature, for this was impossible, but of the glories, the prerogatives, of deity."

Gwynn[1]: "The A. V. fairly expresses the sense, which is that He laid aside, not the essence, which is inalienable, of his Godhead, but that which is relative to finite perceptions, its outward manifestation."

Many other interpretations are given in special works, a large number inclining to the view of Meyer above given.[2] But when inquiry is made as to what is meant by the "*form* of God," then diversities of opinion rise to the surface and the origin of false views of the Incarnation is clearly manifested. Some, like Wiesinger, define μορφη, *form,* as *figure, form, outline,* and as separable from the nature φυσίο or ουσία essence, and they teach, like Hoffman, that "the conceptions of the form of God and form of servant exclude one another." That is, that Christ laid aside the form, the likeness, the appearance, of God, and assumed the form, the likeness, of a man. Others, like Gess and the eminent Godet, teach that the pre-existent Logos laid aside the attributes of deity and became man. His omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, his unchangeable holiness, his perfect love, infinite in range, and even his personal consciousness as the eternal Son—"That consciousness of Sonship, which [says Godet][3] was his light, he let be extin-

[1] In *The Speaker's Commentary,* Phil. ii, 7.

[2] But not all. Following the verb εκένωσεν we should expect a defining genitive showing of what our Lord emptied himself but Paul does not use one. Bishop Ellicott among the English commentators writes, "Would not the logically exact genitive be τοῦ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. This 'aequa*liter* esse' he gave up, and in the manner specified in the participial clauses." Among the Germans, De Wette says, "Nach dem Zusammenhange bezicht sich dos κενὸν nicht auf die μορφή Sondern auf das εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ.

[3] *Etudes Bibl.,* p. 135.

guished within him, to retain only his inalienable personality, his 'Ego,' endowed with liberty and intelligence as every human 'Ego.' . . . In virtue of this abasement he was able to enter into a human development completely similar to ours." That is to say, if Godet is correct, the Son of God plunged into the waters of Lethe, where all remembrance of the past is forgotten, and became absolutely unconscious of his divinity.

But let us examine some of these erroneous theories and erroneous interpretations. First, now, it will be seen that this view of Godet is not in fact an incarnation at all, but something like a metamorphosis of God into man. God *becomes* man. This is the view also shared by Thomasius, Reuss, Hoffman, Delitzsch, Schmieder, Hahn, and other writers on Christological subjects who have given to this question much profound thought. Schmieder says: "The Son of God became man; that is, he renounced his self-conscious divine personal being and took the form of a spiritual potence, which, self-forgotten, as unconscious formative power worked in the womb of Mary, and formed a body which was fitted so to serve the development of this spiritual potence that it could use it as its own property and become conscious, could develop itself therein, and by means thereof put forth its energy."

Hoffman says, "We are not to think that in this self-depotentiation the Logos ceased to be God. He remains *who* he was, though he has ceased to be *what* he was." Hahn expresses a similar view, stating that "the Son of God retained the essence of Godhead but reduced to a potence in which the absolute spirit lay

only as a germ." Now, while it is not difficult to conceive of God as quiescent, that is, as refraining from the exercise of omnipotence or any of his glorious attributes, as we must think of him in eternity before the outgoing of his energy in creation, yet it is not possible for us to conceive of deity as void, as denuded of those qualities, powers, or faculties which are eternally inherent in his nature. It is as impossible to conceive of God as not being omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, infinite, as it is to think of light as not illuminating.

If we imagine ourselves to have conceived of such a God he is not God. Whatever else such a being may be, he is less than God, the Infinite and the Absolute, since he is lacking in just those very attributes which enter into any true concept of his absoluteness. He is the All. Nothing can be outside of him, or lacking in him in whom all must be. Nor can we say that by act of infinite will God can denude himself of his attributes because he is God, for the irrepressible question then arises, Can God commit suicide? This question, which shows the fallacy of Godet, Reuss, Thomasius, and others, who in seeking to construct a scientific Christology maintain that the Logos stripped himself of his divine attributes when he assumed human nature, must inevitably arise, since the attributes of God, not the exercise of them, but the infinite and eternal powers and potencies of his being, are *of* his being, and can no more be dissociated *from* his being than the power to will can be abstracted from the human will and that will remain a human will. It therefore follows that, if the Logos did lay aside his

inherent and eternal attributes, he did not only change from *"what"* he was but also from *"who"* he was, and instead of being God he literally became or is converted into man, and we have therefore, in the Incarnation, not "God manifested in the flesh," but a Something which is not God *becoming* flesh, a Something which was Infinite becoming finite—an impossible conclusion. The eternal cannot become temporal, nor can the infinite become finite. The whole can never become the part.

But if Christ really denuded himself of the attributes of God—his omniscience, omnipotence, infinite love, omnipresence—what was he? These attributes of the divine being are not accidental, they inhere in the essence of his life and without them he is not God. Nor is it conceivable that in reality the eternal Logos could utterly lay aside his omniscience, his omnipotence, or any of the essential qualities of his divine nature. If he did, then Christ was not God manifested in the flesh. He was not God at all, but a divine spirit metamorphosed into a human spirit, and we have once more the old Apollinarian doctrine that the Logos became, or was, the human soul in the man Christ Jesus.

This theory is apparently in the interest of the real humanity of our Lord, but in fact it destroys the very integrity of the humanity it seeks to maintain by putting the emptied, the self-denuded, God-stripped Logos in the place of the soul in the human person. The reality of the humanity of the Redeemer cannot be sacrificed thus, nor, on the other hand, can we surrender the reality of his essential divinity, for in him,

in the visible, historic, human Christ, says the apostle, "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." What, then, is the teaching of the Scripture on this profound mystery?

First. The apostle states, first and clearly, the pre-existence of Christ. Prior to the time when he took the form of a servant he was, says the apostle, in the form of God. This was his original natural mode of existence, as it is of the eternal Father. He was in the bosom of the Father. He was God.

Second. This existence in the form of God did not come to an abrupt termination at the moment of incarnation, as many assume, and was, after a suspension of thirty years, again assumed in the glory of the Ascension, when he sat down again on the throne of the Father. The imperfect particle *ὑπάρχων*, as Canon Gifford shows, used by the apostle, denotes *indefinite continuity* or *being,* continuous existence of the state or condition of the thing spoken of. Wherefore our blessed Lord, being or existing eternally in the form of God prior to his incarnation, did not cease to exist in that form during any period of his earthly life.[1]

Third. The next statement of the apostle is that Christ existed in the *"form of God."* What is this form? It does not signify, as is assumed by many

[1] Il n'y a que le mot *εγενετο* qui affirme positivement qu'en venant il changea en *modus essendi.* D'un autre coté, cependant, *ἐν σαρκι* est plus précis que *σαρξ*, parce qu'il montre que le verbe s'est revêtu seulement de chair, et n'a point changé son es use en chair. . . . La vie terrestre du verbe incarné est et doit être une révélation incessante de la divinité. Elle est nommée un *σκηνοῦν ἐν ἀνθρώποις*, ce que les mots français *habiter, demeurer* ne rendent qu'imparfaitement, *σκηνοῦν* שָׁכַן שְׁכִינָה est dans la philosophie religieuse des juifs le terme technique pour désigner la presence personelle de la divinité dans le monde féeri.—Reuss, *Hist. De la Théol. Chrét.* Livre v. 362.

eminent authorities, the "shape," the "figure," the "outline," the "fashion," of God, for this would confound the word μορφη with σχημα which denotes "scheme," "outline," "figure," "plan." Bishop Lightfoot in his examination of these terms shows that σχημα "suggests the idea of something changeable, fleeting, unsubstantial," while *form* denotes that aggregate of qualities by which we recognize the thing itself; it is unchangeable, and is inseparable from the thing itself. "The Morphæ of a definite thing," he says, "as such, as for instance of a lion or a tree, is one only, while its σχημα may change every minute." Lord Bacon (*Norvum Organum,* Book II), looking into the philosophy of things, says: "The form of a nature is such that, given the form, the nature infallibly follows. Therefore it is always present, when the nature is present, and universally implies it, and is constantly inherent in it. Again, the form is such, that, if it be taken away, the nature infallibly vanishes."[1] Neither the nature, then, nor the essence of a thing can exist without its form; it is inseparable from them and includes all that they are. From this it therefore follows that the "*form* of God" in which Christ existed prior to his incarnation is inseparable from the *nature* or the *essence* of God. It does not mean his "glory around the throne," as Meyer thinks, nor any temporal manifestation of his presence in human history or prophetic vision, nor any sudden blazing forth of his intolerable splendor.

Fourth. But if this is correct then Christ did not empty himself of the "form of God." He did not strip

[1] Canon Gifford on *The Incarnation.*

himself of that which is inseparable from the nature and essence of God when he took the form of a servant, for in that case he would cease to be God, which is unthinkable; but God he was eternally, and God he continued to be throughout his earthly sojourn with the children of men.

And this appears to be the explicit teaching of Holy Scripture. Paul declares, "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell," that is, the fullness of deity, Col. 1. 15. Also that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." These declarations cannot be reconciled with the idea of a "depotentiated Logos." Nor can the testimony of Jesus concerning himself, "He that seeth me seeth the Father," "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will," "I and my Father are one," and many other passages in the fourth gospel which teach Christ's equality with God. Certainly the life of the Father is not emptied of deity and therefore he who is one with the Father, in whom essential deity in all fullness dwells, who is the *Alter Ego* of the Father, his life cannot be a depotentiated life.

Fifth. Of what, then, did he empty himself? What was that which he laid aside when he entered the sphere of humanity. He laid aside not the form of God but his *equality with God.* The apostle says that, although Christ existed as God, exercising all powers and prerogatives of God, yet he did not selfishly maintain this mode of existence, this equality, as if it was something to be held with desperate eagerness, as one

clings to a rich booty, but, since men needed his help, he *emptied* himself, stripped himself of this *equality,* and put himself for redemption purposes in another quality; in the lower relation of an obedient servant to the will of the Father. He did not denude himself of the nature, of the essence, nor of the attributes of God, which he could not, but only of that regnant equality which was his by nature from everlasting. By a voluntary act of his own will in redeeming love he entered the sphere of humanity through the agency of the Spirit of all life and was born as a true human person, by uniting himself to a human soul which never had existence apart from the Logos.

The insuperable difficulties of this holy mystery here confront us. We will not presume to enter further this arcanum of the holiest, nor can we if we would. How the infinite and eternal can enter the temporal and the finite, even with our modern ideas of the immanence of God, appears to many an insoluble enigma.

Mysteries of being, questions of time and space, of the infinite and the eternal in relation to the Cosmos, stand here like cherubim with swords of flame about this awful mystery which is God's secret and not man's. We cannot hope to fathom the depths of the infinite. But it is utterly irrational to assume, because such questions cannot be made as simple and plain as the multiplication table, that therefore the whole Christian doctrine of the Incarnation must be laid aside as another unintelligible product of metaphysical theology. God is not outside his universe. Time and space are not external to him who is infinite and absolute. While he transcends all worlds, and all time, he

is nevertheless the Immanent God, and therefore the possibility of God manifesting himself in the world, in time and in space, can never be denied by rational thought. As Lotze, the greatest among German philosophers, observes, "We are not to picture the absolute placed in some remote region of extended space and separated from the world of its creations, so that its influence has to retraverse a distance and make a journey in order to reach things; for its indivisible unity, omnipresent at every point, would fill this space as well as others. . . . Wherever in apparent space an organic germ has been formed, at that very spot, and not removed from it, the absolute is present. . . . We may regard the process by which things that possess life and soul are formed as something unusual and superior; but the presence of the absolute which makes this process possible is no less the basis necessarily implied in the most insignificant interaction of any two atoms. Nor, again, do we think of its presence as a mere uniform breath which penetrates all places, and this particular spot among the rest, like that subtle, formless, and homogeneous ether from which many strange theories expect the vivification of matter into the most various forms; but the absolute is indivisibly present with the whole inner wealth of its nature in this particular spot, and in obedience to those laws of its action which it has itself laid down necessarily makes additions to the simple conjunction of those elements which are themselves only its own continuous actions."[1]

Hence, just because God is the absolute, is it possi-

[1] *Metaphysic*, 246.

ble for him to manifest himself anywhere in the relative, in the universe which is his and which he upholds and continues in existence by the word of his power. Indeed, the contrary supposition, as Herbert Spencer maintained in his *First Principles,* degenerates into absurdity, since it affirms the impenetrability of the universe to Infinite Spirit; that is, that God has built a Cosmos which he cannot enter—which is sheer contradiction, since in that supposition it never could have been created. The manifestation of God at any time, at any place, whether it be in a burning bush, amid the crags of Sinai, in the glory that overshadowed the mercy seat, or at the baptism of Jesus by the river's brink, is nothing more than the coming forth of that being who is behind all and in all, and is at all times as near to every atom in any part of his universe as he is to every rolling orb. In thus manifesting himself in time and space God does not *become* temporal and spatial. The infinite does not *become,* is not *converted* or *metamorphosed* into, the finite. Now, while this is true, it is on the other hand nevertheless clear to reason, as a necessary condition of thought, that, if the Infinite enters or manifests itself within the rim of the finite, to live the life of the finite, it must enter under the limitations of the finite.

Every revelation of God, if it is to become a vital force in humanity, must come out of the abstract into the concrete, out of the realm of contemplation and speculation and assume intelligible form; that is, become a fact in human experience. Otherwise it remains apart from the life of humanity. So if the Infinite One should will to manifest himself to men,

as the culminating end of moral evolution, the climax of his gradual revelation through all preceding ages, he must take such form as will be cognizable to human faculties. To be known to the human he must become human. But in becoming human he must, in the nature of things, be limited to the faculties of the human. Not that he becomes *only* human, for then he would be of no help to humanity, since in that case he would be on the same plane with the human and therefore involved in all that is human; but while he manifests himself in the human he still remains what he is, the superhuman.

Christ, the Son of God, did this. By the exercise of infinite will, the central principle of all sentient being, human or divine, he assumed human nature, with its limitations, in the womb of the virgin. What the life of the child was, that was his life. Was he omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient? In the core of his essential being as the very substance of God he *possessed* the fullness of the Godhead, and outside the sphere of humanity he still exercised cosmic functions,[1] but as man every attribute of his deity is limited, is restricted, is placed alongside of or united with the powers and attributes of the human spirit. God is not less infinite, if we may use such terms for illustrative purposes, not less omnipresent, when he reveals himself locally to Moses in the bush or to Isaiah seated

[1] Reuss, *Hist. Chrét.*, p. 365, says: "Le Christ, sur cette terre, est dans un rapport non interrompu avec le ciel; qui est toujours ouvert pour lui (Jean i. 32); il est en possession de la plénitude de sa gloire comme de la grâce et de la vérité (Jean i. 14); en un mot, tout ce que nous avons dit jusqu'ici sur la nature, les conditions et le but de l'incarnation execute jusqu'à l'idée d'un état d'inanition, d'une κένωσις."

on a throne. While speaking to Moses he is still guiding Arcturus with his suns, still holding in place the moons of Jupiter and maintaining at their true angle the rings of Saturn. What God the Father can do, God manifested in the flesh may do.

Christ *possessed* the fullness of the Eternal. He possessed omnipotence, omnipresence, and all other essential attributes of God. But he was not at all times exclusively conscious of his infinite knowledge and power apart from his human limitations. He did not know himself at all times as absolutely God, yet he knows he is divine. Were he conscious, every moment and always, of his essential Godhood he could not have been conscious at that same moment of his manhood, and the humanity of him would have been pushed into the background or would have been lost in his divinity. Man himself—every man—is divine, having come from God, being made in the image of God, and in every man there are elements or qualities of the divine. But who, what man of all the millions of the race, is conscious of his divinity? Who among the holiest of the holy has ever dared to say, "I am God," or to assert his oneness with God? So our divine Lord, though *possessing* the fullness of the Godhead, as the apostle Paul teaches, was not always conscious of his essential Godhood—that is, the absolute God-consciousness was not always present, exclusive, and crowding out or blurring his human consciousness. He never knows himself other than he is—the God-man. And yet, in the depths of his being he does know that *the God is in* the Man. He does know that he is from eternity; that before Abra-

ham was he was; that he came from the Father, and is one with the Father.

How intense was this consciousness of divinity in our Lord of his oneness in nature and essence with the eternal Father, may be seen in the specific declarations of himself in the gospels. Study intently the significance of such passages as Matt. 11. 27; Luke 10. 22; John 1. 18; 6. 46; 10. 30; 14. 9-11; 16. 15; 17. 25, 26, and many others, and, however difficult it may be to form a clear concept of the fact, the truth nevertheless is borne in upon us that he who stood there as a man before men knew himself to be the eternal Son of God. Those who heard him understood him to make that claim, when he said, *"I and the Father are one,"* for they took up stones to stone him, and he knew they so understood him, as he intended they should, and he also clearly understood them in their objection to his teaching, which they denounced as blasphemy; saying, "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." Opposition to the deity of Christ, then, is not new. The arguments which skeptics make today Christ himself heard when here on earth, and nothing stronger has ever been urged by modern rationalists against the essential divinity of Christ than that which he heard that day, "Thou being a man makest thyself God," and which he so triumphantly refuted.

How the Christ could possess the attributes of the absolute God and yet be unconscious of these attributes may seem self-contradictory, since it would appear that one must know, must be conscious of, what he is in possession of. But this is only apparently so;

only so on the surface. We all possess knowledge of things and events of which we are not distinctly conscious every moment it is called for. All our knowledge is not always present in consciousness. It is there, in the depths, but not on the surface. It is not lost because not remembered instantly. We do not lose all knowledge of foreign lands, of strange cities, of cathedrals, and galleries of art while we are occupied with the stirring scenes and activities of our own country and everyday life. So was it in the experience of Jesus. He possessed knowledge and power which were divine, but the clear, unclouded consciousness of the attributes of the Eternal was not at every moment of his life a present and distinctly felt experience. Only when the occasion arises, when the vital moment arrives which by reason of moral or other issues demands the voice and deed of divinity, then, and then only, does the mighty God appear in majesty and wonder-working power. "Who is this man," whom we have just aroused from the slumber of the worn and weary, "that even the winds and the waves obey him?" It was not the humanity, but the divinity of Jesus that astonished his disciples.

The God never appears beyond the human. They are one. Here, as in all creation, God works in harmony with law: the law which is the divine idea of fitness, the law which underlies the plan of creation and governs the play of all its mighty energies. The self-limitation of God in the Incarnation is, along similar lines discernible in nature, for there we see the working of omnipotence not in random, reckless display of almighty power, but by orderly processes;

by means, laws, and not by divine fiats. God puts himself into his work. It is conceivable that the Infinite could manifest himself in some other way than this way, but what way could be more in harmony with natural law than the method he adopted in assuming the nature of man? In nature he limits his power, in man he limits himself. The child Jesus, like the boy Jesus, is a human child. He grows in stature, in knowledge of his surroundings, in the favor of God, in the knowledge of books and of men. The gospel according to Luke, 2. 40, 52, distinctly states that *"the child grew, and waxed strong, becoming full of wisdom"*—πληρουμενον σοφίας—, that *"Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."*

The law of life is growth. All perfection, moral, spiritual, intellectual, or physical, must be obtained, because of the essential nature or constitution of our being, through growth. There is no change, no suspension of natural law suggested in the distinct statement of Saint Luke. The Christ-child is no astounding embodiment of violated law. We are not presented with a picture of a babe having the mind of a Newton or a Faraday, a child having in conscious use the omniscience and omnipotence of a God. A child brain cannot respond to any other than a child mind, and a child mind cannot have more than child knowledge, faculty, power, perception, understanding. It cannot be Scripture teaching, then, that Jesus as a child, as a boy, as a youth, knew that he was God or had the powers of God. The human mind at every stage of its growth can understand that knowledge

only which is on a level with its powers. The mind of Michael Angelo, of Herbert Spencer, or of a Gladstone, cannot be put into the brain of a child. All knowledge, then, of God, of his relation to God, of the unseen world, of his mission on earth, which Jesus possessed, must have been such as the human mind can naturally receive at each stage of its development. The personal consciousness is never wholly a God-consciousness, for the God-consciousness is one with the human consciousness. As the mental and spiritual powers and faculties expand the divine expands in the life with them. The God is not inactive. It cannot, however, by reason of its own prior self-determination, act beyond the nature or the power of the will and thought and affection, of the laws and potencies, of the human nature with which it is united and through which it knows itself as incarnated. But with the development of the years there is a development of the God-consciousness also, and Christ *knows* that he is the Son of God, he knows that he is the everlasting Son of the Father who existed in eternal glory before all worlds began; he knows that he was in the bosom of the Father before God ever lighted the infinite void with the fires of newly-created suns, or ever the glorious hierarchy of heaven sprang into being. This is the mystery of the incarnation, the glory and grandeur of God in the outgoing of his infinite love for the redemption of man.

It will probably be objected that too much is affirmed in the above concerning our Lord's knowledge. There are those who insist that outside his intuitive power of discernment, his marvelous spiritual insight,

his knowledge was of the same kind and along similar planes and of like scope with that of other men of his time. The Ritschlian school and its exponents thus contend strongly for a real limitation in our Lord's knowledge. This view more or less modified is also held by Dr. Sanday, *Oracles of God;* Forrest, *The Christ of History and Experience;* Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ;* Ottley, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation,* and other well known writers. The question cannot be settled outside the facts upon which these opinions are based, and for the facts we must go to the Scriptures.

Now, a study of the gospels discloses that there are two kinds or classes of texts which pertain directly to this subject. We cannot accept the one and reject or modify the other. Both must be taken together. But if taken together they seem to be irreconcilable; for the evidence of the one class is modified or canceled by the other. This is so apparent that those who deny the essential deity of our Lord and those who fail to keep in mind his dual character explain away all evidence of his omniscience, just as those who see nothing but the God are utterly oblivious to every evident limitation of his knowledge. But it must be evident that, given the person of Christ—a human and a divine personality—the manifestations of that personality must also be human and divine. The dual nature, therefore, of the facts, that is, the texts recorded in the gospels is just what we should expect, and whatever irreconcilability there may be between them is no greater than the fact or facts they record; no greater than that which exists between his human-

ity and his divinity in one personality. Christ possessed knowledge as he possessed power. He is not always working miracles, but the power to work miracles is always present. In the gospels there are evidences that Christ possessed knowledge surpassing human experience. The texts which sustain this are Matt. 11. 21, 27; 17. 27; Mark 14. 30; Luke 9. 47; 19. 30; 22. 10; John 1. 14; 2. 24, 25; 4. 17, 29, 47, 50; 13. 11. Of course it will be insisted that these passages do not prove more than special illumination or that they may be paralleled in the records of prophets and apostles. But the gospels do not narrate these instances of superhuman knowledge as if they were flashes of prophetic insight; such is not the standpoint of the evangelists. To them Christ is more than prophet and more than the apostles whom he himself had chosen. It must also be admitted that there are Scripture passages which unmistakably indicate limitations of Christ's knowledge, such as Matt. 12. 15; 24; Mark 6. 6; 11. 13; 12. 28; 13. 32; Luke 2. 40, 49, 52; 8. 30; John 4. 1-13; 11. 34.

On the subject as a whole we can only say that above this confined knowledge of prophet and psalmist and inspired apostle there is the higher knowledge which no seer or prophet who had vision or dream of God ever claimed as Christ did. Abraham knew God through successive revelations. Moses saw God, "and the Lord spoke unto Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend," Exod. 33. 11. But the vision was incomplete. Just as the influence of God's holy Spirit in the souls of his saints quickens intenser desire for God, this glimpse of the beatific vision pro-

duced in the heart of Moses an insatiable yearning for a more intimate knowledge, a deeper experience of God: "I beseech thee," he cries, "show me thy glory." But this could not be. The unveiled God cannot be seen by mortal eyes. "Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live." Isaiah and other prophets had visions of the God of glory, but no vision, no knowledge of God here or hereafter is of that kind which Christ affirmed was his, and is his only, from eternity. "No one knoweth the Father save the Son." "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is from God, he hath seen the Father." "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." "I speak those things which I have seen with my Father." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak . . . I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me." "O Father, glorify thou me . . . with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

Here is knowledge and claim to knowledge which is not *about* God, but of the very being of God and of the contents of the divine mind. Jesus in his divine consciousness is *in* the Father. It is not a human experience but an incommunicable consciousness of essential oneness with him. He *is,* not *was,* in the Father, and knows all that the Father does. Under what forms of thought this divine knowledge was communicated to the human mind of Jesus, so that in any way apart

from the Logos mind with which it was united it could apprehend and make known, in human speech if necessary, the secret things of God, it would be useless to inquire. All we can say is that whatever knowledge is communicated to the human mind must be communicated according to the laws of mind. But not only our Lord's knowledge of God, his knowledge of man also evidences the possession of a power which, like the power of working miracles, is without limit. "Come, see a man who told me all that ever I did!" cries the Samaritan woman, and she knows with an appalling conviction that every page in her spotted life's history is open to him, that he can call up from the dead every sin of the past as easily as he reminded her that "he whom thou now hast is not thy husband." He knew what was *in* man—τι ἦν ἐν τῳ ἀνθρώπῳ—John 2. 23-25. This is not knowledge on the same plane with the gift of "discerning of spirits" mentioned in 1 Cor. 12. 10, nor of that prophetic gift seen in Elisha, 1 Kings 8. 39. It is that knowledge of the essence of man, of his secret life, of his habitual mental state, half-formed thought and longing, which God alone has or can have. He knew what was *in* man; that is, all the realities and possibilities of his inner being. One evangelist says he "saw the *thoughts*" of men (Matthew), another (Mark) that he saw their *"reasonings."* This of course may be said, as daily experience teaches, of many men of penetrating knowledge of human nature; but what lifts this knowledge of Jesus above all such intuitive powers is the fact that often before the thought is fully formed even in the mind he answers it, and dumfounds and dismays his

enemies by revealing to them their own forming thought which they themselves had not fully grasped or formulated for utterance, Matt. 9. 2-8; 2. 1-12; Luke 5. 17-26. What a revelation to each one, of his own acts, was that which Christ gave to those who brought before him the woman taken in adultery. He had not accused any of them of anything, and yet when he began to write on the ground they "went out one by one," feeling in their hearts that he knew them and all that ever they did. It was not that "the guilty conscience needs no accuser," nor that "conscience makes cowards of us all." It was no shrinking away from a mysterious act which had an undefined but significant meaning for them. It was the cowardice of the soul conscious of the searching eye of God. They felt, in a way they could perhaps never explain, that the secrets of their hearts and lives, hidden in the deepest recesses of being, were all open to him, and that his knowledge was their judgment.

As to limitation of our Lord's knowledge the several passages above referred to would indicate on the face of them that as man, acting and teaching in the ordinary way of men, his knowledge was not without limitation. We must never lose sight of the fact that he was God-*man*. In Mark 11. 13 he expresses surprise that the barren fig tree was so soon withered. He shows surprise at the lack of faith in men (Mark 6. 6). He asks for information, "How long is it ago since this came unto him?" (Mark 9. 20) and of Mary he asks, "Where have you laid him?" (John 11. 34.) He seems to acquire new knowledge, as in Matt. 2. 15, "When Jesus knew it he withdrew himself from

thence," and also in John 4. 1-3, "When the Lord knew . . . He left Judea." Many other passages will occur to the reader. Clearly these scriptures show limitation in our Lord's knowledge. The Scriptures do not manufacture a Christ, they simply show us the Christ as he was, as he was seen by his contemporaries. That his knowledge at times was limited is only saying that he was human, subjected to human conditions of thought and feeling, and yet these same Scriptures forbid us, yea, they make it impossible for us, ever to think of the Christ who had power to destroy the barren fig tree, who could heal the sick child, who could raise the dead Lazarus, as being held fast in the circumscribing limitation of human inability, and so submerged in human doubt and error in common with the race that he could never break through the fogs and shadowy twilights, the mazes and bewilderments, of human reason into the clear light of the God within him and in that light discern and judge all things. In these Scriptures we see the Christ who does not know. But the Christ who does not know is always the Christ who can know.

It is a useless expenditure of labor, then, to so explain these texts, both those that teach superhuman knowledge and those also that teach limitation, that they shall mean the opposite of what they really do mean and were intended to mean. Certainly we cannot explain everything in the consciousness of our Lord. Even after we have done all that ingenuity, discourteous boldness, or loving piety may do we shall yet have at our final result no means whatever of verifying our conclusions. Far away and beyond us the awful mys-

tery of the Christ looms like mountain peaks lost in darkling clouds, and, while we may in some small way comprehend what is obvious and lies nearest to us, nevertheless the secret of his being is hidden from our eyes. The result of prolonged reflection on the scripture referred to compels us to adopt the conclusion we have stated, which to us is a lucid fact that the knowledge of Christ was of like character, in perfect keeping, with his personality.

Again, it is quite possible that the objection which Professor Bruce urges against the Kenotic theory of Thomasius may be thought by some to be equally valid against the view we have above set forth. "The Thomasian form of Kenotic theory," says Professor Bruce, "is open to objection with reference to the personal unity. It teaches the presence in Christ of two life centers: the depotentiated Logos and the human soul. Now this doctrine is in danger of being impaled on one or other of the horns of the following dilemma. Either these two life centers are 'homogeneous magnitudes' or they are not. If they are not, then a dualism ensues in the consciousness of the God-man and the depotentiation of the Logos has taken place in vain; for the very object of that depotentiation was to exclude dualism. Such dualism can be escaped only by a perfect equality of the two life centers in spiritual endowment. The two yokefellows must draw equally and keep pace, else the course of human development will be other than smooth and harmonious. If, on the other hand, the two life centers be homogeneous, then the unity of self-consciousness may indeed be secured; but only with the effect of raising the ques-

tion: To what purpose this duality in the life basis? Why two human souls to do the work of one? for, *ex hypothesi,* the depotentiated Logos is to all intents and purposes a human soul. Instead of this roundabout process, according to which the Logos first reduces himself to the dimensions of a human soul and then associates with himself another human soul, why not say at once the Logos became a human soul? On the Thomasian theory, the depotentiated Logos, or, if you will, the human soul of Christ, is degraded from the position of a necessary constituent of the personality to that of a dispensable ornament. The two life centers, the self-reduced Logos and the human soul, are like the two eyes or the two ears of a man. As the sensations of both organs coalesce in one mental act of perception the duality of the organs does not produce any duality of consciousness while it adds to the symmetry and grace of the person, but, on the other hand, it is not necessary to the act of perception, one eye or ear being able to do the work of the two."

Now a casual examination will show that the above objection does not lie against the view we have propounded. For, first, we do not assert two "homogeneous magnitudes." There are not two centers, two personalities, but one; for the human soul of the Christ never had an instant's existence separate and distinct from the uncreated Logos. The divine enters into and becomes one with the human, and this is possible by "the perfect equality of the two in spiritual endowment," *both being spirit.* The human spirit is the image of the divine Spirit, and therefore, since the two are essentially alike, there can be neither distinction,

contradiction, nor opposition, but perfect equality only, and perfect oneness. And, secondly, to the question, "To what purpose this duality in the life basis?" the sufficient answer is that "the purpose" involves the reason for the incarnation, and answers the old Anselmic problem, Why was God made man? Sinful man cannot redeem himself. Whoever, burdened with the consciousness of guilt, attempts to free himself from the slavery of inborn depravity or the gravitating power of evil tendencies discovers at once within himself an irreconcilable contradiction between his will to do and his power to accomplish. "The good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." Nor is this the expression of a pious self-depreciation of a spiritual genius whose aspirations for moral perfectibility preëminently exalt him above the mass of humanity. It is the experience of humanity itself. Long before Paul wrote the Seventh of Romans the Roman poet Ovid also wrote,

> "I know and approve the better way
> But follow the worse,"

and the moralists of every age, whether pagan or Christian—whether it be Euripides or Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius or Cicero, Horace or the monks of the desert, an Antony, a Pachomius or a Saint John of Catama—all bear testimony to the innate impotence of man to save himself. After all striving for the ideal good—for the possession of that inward peace in which no moral antimony suggests dissonance with the eternal order of things—we are all compelled at last to say with Seneca, "What is it, Lucullus, which draws us one way when we would go another?" or

rather to cry out with Saint Paul, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

Only God could redeem humanity, for God only is greater than the sum of humanity. Nor could God alone, as pure spirit, do this, since it was not God who sinned, and pure spirit cannot experience the human life with all that is involved therein. Hence it is written of Christ, who was God incarnated, or manifested in the flesh, "He took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Since "the children are partakers of flesh and blood he also himself likewise took part of the same." It was human nature that sinned, and it is human nature that must be redeemed, therefore, Infinite Love assumes human nature, and in this human nature he pays the penalty of human nature. Thus the purpose of the duality in Christ Jesus is clearly apprehended in the light of the reason for the incarnation. The incarnation of the Son of God is no after-thought, no impulse of divine pity first conceived at the moment of the fall. It is an eternal thought, without it the universal cosmos would never have been. Love, eternal and infinite love, is the cause, the foundation, and crown of the universe, and upon the fact of the incarnation, determined in eternity and accomplished in time, the whole creation of God rests and in it alone finds its justification.

Christ is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." God is a moral being. He must justify himself for his creation, the work of his hands, for the sin and misery and suffering and the long-drawn anguish of the slowly evolving ages. He will do it. The eternities are his. Infinite love created, infinite

love will redeem and forever glorify. So that of him of whom it is written, "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made," and of whom the apostle says, "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him" (Col. 1. 16); of him it is also written, "Who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God" (Heb. 12. 2).

CHAPTER XI

The Lesson for the Modern Life

Every truth is a revelation. Gazing on this act of self-emptying of the Logos, and going back from the act to the motive behind it, we see, as we could not see without this manifestation, the essential quality of the divine nature.

So universal and persistent are the manifestations of almightiness in earth and sea and sky, that power, infinite power, impresses our thought as the dominant note of the universe, while the moral, the more lovable, qualities of the being of God follow only as an afterglow of his excellent glory. But in this self-stripping of the Logos we see the heart of God. It is a revelation such as humanity never had. God was spoken of, and he speaks of himself, as a Father, but here is a clear unshadowed revelation of his essence, a revelation set forth perhaps in some dim suggestive way in the build of the universe, in its beauty and order, in the instincts of love and sympathy in human nature and discernible in increasing strength as we proceed in our study of rudimentary forms up the ascent of life to man, but never beaming forth with such clearness as in the incarnation, the revelation that God is Love.

But the incarnation is not only a revelation of the nature of God, it is also a revelation of the real nature of man; such a nature as man had not heretofore discovered nor God revealed.

In the development of the race we cannot but observe a corresponding development or enlargement of the concept of man. Nowhere in the old world of the Babylonian, the Egyptian, the Greek, or the Roman do we find such an estimate of man as is found within the circle of the Hebrew people. It was a common practice in Rome to maim unfortunate children or, like the Lacedæmonians and the Spartans, even as Plato recommended, expose them to hunger or the wild beasts. We all recall the instance related by Tacitus, that because a slave killed his master six hundred innocent slaves were sacrificed. Plutarch tells us that Flaminius put a slave to death for the entertainment of his friend who had never witnessed a death scene. Pollio, the Stoic, fed his fishes with the limbs of his slaves. The sacredness of man was a foreign thought to the Roman. In Athens, even in the day of Pericles, five thousand persons not Athenians were either banished the city or sold into slavery. But, two hundred years before Athens reached her glory under Pericles, the Hebrew people read in the book of Leviticus, "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself." And among no people, in spite of their opulence, their sculptured cities, their conquests, their philosophy and poetry and art and the marvelous skill of their workmen, was there such civilization, such humanity, justice, equality, and freedom, such home-life, such reverence for woman, tenderness and care for children, hospitality for strangers, respect for law, as among these people through whom came the revelation of the true God to man.

We would not ignore nor depreciate the many noble expressions of Grecian philosophers and poets concerning the nature of man, nor the lofty sentiments found here and there in the writings of the Stoics, nor must we read into them more than is meant. Not in all the literature of the pagan world, whether we recall the tragedies of Sophocles or Euripides, the *Ethics* of Aristotle or the *Republic* of Plato, the hymn of Cleanthes, the sayings of Democritus and Epictetus, the writings of Cicero, of Seneca, or the *Thoughts* of Marcus Aurelius—not in all this is there a single sentence which in depth of meaning, in clear recognition of the inherent dignity and worth of man, can be compared with sentences that may be picked up at random in the books of the Old Testament, or with that splendid outburst in the eighth Psalm: "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor." A true concept of man depends upon a true concept of God, and this the pagan world did not possess.

But, high as the concept of man is in the Old Testament, in the incarnation there is yet higher revelation of the nature of man. We know as other ages have not known the wondrous intellectual powers of man, we see the products of his teeming brain in the arts and sciences, and we have also seen the revelation of his spiritual capacity in prophet and priest and in his own deep yearnings and gropings for the Infinite, as

> "An infant crying in the night,
> An infant crying for the light,
> And with no language but a cry,"

but in the assumption of human nature by the Son of

God himself we see as we have never seen, as we never could have conceived, the spiritual correspondence, the essential likeness and kinship, between God and man. Whatever physical science may have to say as to the lowly origin of man, here is what he is. God does not have to force himself into human nature, and when in it find himself unable to manifest himself in it through lack of revealing capacity in the human, nor is the human unable to bear the weight, the presence, of deity. But because man is spirit, because he has intelligence, and reason, and will, and affection, because he is a moral being, Infinite Spirit, Infinite Wisdom, and Infinite Love can adjust himself to the spirit of man—laying every power and quality of God alongside of every corresponding faculty in the human soul without violence to the soul—and thus manifest himself as God in the flesh. The astounding revelation dawns on us for the first time that the human may embody the eternal.

Now the truth which is borne to us here, and is of special need—is eminently fitted to the needs of our modern life—is the *infinite worth of man.* This is no new discovery. We are fully aware that it is an old truth, that it has long been in our possession, that it helped to create the ideal society of the early Christians; that it modified Roman law; that it was a potent element in all the struggles for freedom in Western civilization; that it abolished slavery and wrought reforms; that it is imbedded in our laws and literature, and underlies the civilization, the political and social institutions, of modern society. But the gospel of Christ has a special message and a fresh application

to every age. This truth is known to us, but when we look into the social status of modern life and note the intense struggle for wealth and power, the fierce conflicts between labor and capital, the alignment of class against class, there is need, imperative need, for a reaffirmation of the infinite worth of man. There is need that in the midst of the roar of machinery and the clash of human interests the attention of men should be again called to the mighty truths of the incarnation, the basic principles of all true development, which cannot be ignored in our programs of human progress. Man is not an animal. He is not a machine. He is a child of God. The intellectual culture and industrial advancement of modern life have not brought the contentment and happiness that philosophers and agitators proclaimed from the housetops. The redemption of the millions does not lie in education alone, in political clubs and platforms, in labor unions, in social economics, in legislative enactments. Christ placed no confidence in "systems."

> "Nor poppy nor mandragora,
> Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,
> Shall ever medicine thee that sweet sleep
> Which thou owedst yesterday."

The ache of humanity is heart-ache. There is need, then, for the reaffirmation of the infinite worth of man; need for the incoming power of some transfiguring idea on the common life, some heaven-born vision of the innate glory of humanity, which will once more exalt man above the level of the brainless, soulless machine at his side—above the beast of burden, above the degrading passion for power and material gran-

deur as the highest ends—and dignify the *man*. But what can be more ennobling, what can be more inspiring than the truths that spring from the incarnation of the Son of God? And what truths need more to be proclaimed in the ears of this practical, selfish age than this: that he emptied himself and took among us the form of a servant? Hear it then:

> "This is the Gospel of Labor—ring it, ye bells of the kirk:
> The Lord of love
> Came down from above
> To live with the men who work."

Another important and most relevant truth for our modern life disclosed in this revelation of the heavenward side of the incarnation is the *divine method of redemption.*

Method is the key to results. The secret of scientific progress since the days of Bacon lies in the change of method. Method is everything. The genius of invention discovers how to do things. The scientist, the philosophical historian, the statesman, the sociologist, and even the political windbag endeavor to ascertain the one essential means to their respective ends—method. In all efforts to improve social or ethical conditions the tantalizing puzzle, the one imperious question which demands an answer before all else, is one of method; which is the best way to produce the best results. We all know that the history of modern attempts for the amelioration of social conditions in our large cities is in large measure the history of experiment and of discarded theories. And what shall we say, taking a wider view, of the universal struggle for the realization of political, social, and religious ideals

which have ever inspired the race? How can the armies of the earth be disbanded? When will diplomacy be other than, as Canon Freemantle says, a register of decrees of violence? how can the idea of human brotherhood be brought out of the realm of mere sentiment, out of the fenceless spaces of the abstract, into the actual practical affairs and relations of our modern life? These are questions to be settled, but the one question before all is, *How?* In answer to this inquiry we may posit this truth, as valid as the gospel from which it is drawn and which is as certain as gravity, that *No theory of social salvation not based on the redemption discoverable in the Doctrine of the Incarnation can ever work out for men the realization of their hopes.*

This law is the law of the struggle for others, the strong for the weak, the divine law of self-abandonment. Of all conceivable methods present in the mind of God for the restoration of humanity this method, involving God himself, is the only one selected. It is therefore the only natural method and the only means by which the best results may be obtained. In nature the principle becomes a deeply rooted instinct. Everywhere we see manifestation of the law that "the strong should bear the burdens of the weak." Vicarious suffering is a law of life. The birds and the beasts struggle to the death in defense of their young. Human love knows no limits, but in the home, where this law has its freest play, the greater the demand of the weak upon the strong the more complete is the surrender of self and the greater and richer the joy of sacrifice. The instinct is in nature because it was first in God the

Creator, who built himself into nature; in him, the eternal Logos, the ground of creation, the primal principle of life and reason in the universe; in him who, "for us men and our salvation," descended from his throne, laid aside his equality with God and took upon him the nature that was to be redeemed, and was found in form and fashion as a man, and "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." "For," says the apostle, "ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich" (2 Cor. 8. 9).

The true method, then, which the incarnation teaches for the spiritual or social redemption of men is this method of self-sacrifice. Men must be saved from within. He who would save another must descend from his plane of superiority and enter the conditions and experience the experiences of the beaten in life's struggles, and thus lift him from within. There is no ascent of the lower to the higher in religion, in biology, or sociology, unless the higher stoops to the lower and lifts it to the higher. Self-renunciation is the law of all moral advancement. Society rests upon moral law, and therefore civilization is, above all else, moral. But morality means duty, regard for others, and the elimination from character of all selfishness and tyranny. But the more complex society becomes the greater is the demand on the individual to repress those instincts which war against social utility, public good, justice, kindness, and brotherly love. Knowledge cannot "grow from more to more" unless the colleges and universities

give themselves to the state in educated citizenship. Music, painting, and sculpture must be social. They must give, pass out of selfish isolation, to the ministry of the beautiful, and "live again in minds made better" by their holy service. Political life becomes corrupt where power is centralized for private gain. Commerce between men and nations can never be maintained where selfishness outweighs justice and trickery outwits honesty. Without self-renunciation there is no salvation. The chasm in our modern life between the rich and the poor, the cultured and the uncultured, the employer and the workman, the gulf wider than the Atlantic that separates men in church, in business, in society, can never be bridged nor wide class antagonisms ever be reconciled till the higher descends to the lower in divine sympathy and a Christlike passion for humanity. The "absent treatment" never cured souls or bodies of men. There is no salvation, social or moral, in any city or nation where the Church of the democratic Christ has become an exclusive aristocracy, where the scholar, the cultured, the refined, avoid the dens of ignorance, the haunts of vice, the gloomy alleys where poverty hides its rags, or refuses to shake the grimy hand of honest toil. The higher must touch the lower.

Fundamental ethical laws apply to all times. They are true yesterday, today, and forever. And when Christ said, "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it," he uttered a law which needs again to be thundered in the souls of all men who set personal ease, wealth, and power before them as the main objects of their lives;

he uttered a law which should be sung out as a bugle note of cheer to those who lay aside the privileges of rank and wealth and, scorning "miserable aims that end with self," join the glorious company of martyrs, philanthropists, and benefactors in their devotion to humanity.

This to us is the meaning of the Kenosis in the incarnation. This is the method of Christ. By this method may society be redeemed and by this method may men be led, as Farrar says, to the larger life, as Virgil led Dante from the lower hells, in whose sulphurous air no angel ever plumed his wing, to the bright light of the stars and the shimmer of the sea.

INDEX

Age, this, intellectual character of, 183
Alford on Phil. 2. 6, 202
Almah, meaning of, 107
Annunciation, memory of and later events, 84
Apocryphal gospels, 88
Aramaic originals, 135
Arnold, M., on miracles, 36
Asia, cities of, Græcized, 93
Articles of belief, restatement of, 1
Artificial explanations of myths, 109

Bacon, Lord, definition of *Form*, 208
Belief, modifications of, 2, 4
Beyschlag's theory of God-filled man, 167
 Theory refuted, 171
Birth, every, a new personality, 142
Birth of Christ, 8, 9. See *Virgin Birth*
Briggs, Professor C. A., 9
Browning, 17
Buddhism and Christianity, 96–101
Bunsen, denial of myth-making, 86
Bousset, Professor, 42, 43

Census of Luke, 19, 20
Christ more than ideal, 3
 Needed, 10
 Religion of spiritual, 26
 Preëxistence of, 39, 140–143
 If not God, 160
 Temptation of, 147
 Harnack's concept of, 114
 Never existed, 20
 Character of, 172–175
 Reveals God, 179, 180
 Limitations of, 216–224
Christ, sinless. See *Sinless*
Cheyne, Professor T. K., theory of virgin birth, 89
Christian experience, 2, 65, 67
Criticism of virgin birth narratives, 7, 8
Church, foundation of, 4
 Not separate from Christ, 26
Confucius, 188
Cranium, comparison of brute and human, 145

Dates of the gospels, 127–129
Divine consciousness, 155
Double consciousness in the Logos, 155
 In God, 156–159
 In the Incarnate Lord, 161

Evidence that Paul knew Luke's gospel, 139
Ellicott on Phil. 2. 6, 202
Equality with God, 209
Experience, Christian, 65, 67
 Illustrations from, 165

Faith of disciples in Jesus, 44, 45
French liberalism, 28–30
Fullness of Godhead in Jesus, 213, 214

Gautama, 188
Gifford on Phil. 2. 6, 207
God, attributes of, 204, 205
 Double consciousness in, 156–160
God consciousness of Jesus, 214
Godet on Aramaic originals, 81
 Theory of Kenosis, 204, 205
Goodsell quoted, 123

Gunkel on Aramaic originals, 81
Gwynn on Phil. 2. 6, 203

Harnack, Berlin lectures of, 12
 His concept of historic Jesus, 13–15
 Objections to his views, 20–24
Heathen concept of man, 231
Human nature of Jesus, 162, 163
Humanity of Jesus destroyed, 206
Human life a mystery, 186–7

Incarnation, needed reaffirmation of, 39, 102
 Definition of, 1
 Must be, 17, 143, 212
 Moral condition of, 149
 Theories of, 9
 Lesson of, for modern life, 230
 A revelation of God's nature, 230
 —— of man's nature, 232
 Wonder of, 32
 Objections to, 36
Immanence of God, 211
Invention of myths, 93
Irreconcilability of Pauline doctrine, 122

Jesus—who was he?, 31
 Claims of, 38–40
 Prophecy relating to, 50–61
 Jesus of rationalism not Jesus of the gospels, 21, 22, 42, 43, 64, 68
 How account for him, 175–179, 189, 200
 The master teacher, 181
 Authoritative teacher, 191
 Universal teacher, 192, 197
 Supreme teacher, 194
 Final teacher, 194, 196
Julius Cæsar, death of, 76
Justin Martyr, 136, 137

Kenosis, 201
 Various theories of, 204
Krishna legend, 112

Law of redemption, 236
Lecky, *History of Morals*, 86
Legends of supernatural births, 91, 95, 104
Lightfoot on Phil. 2. 6, 202
Logos, denial of existence of, 14
Lötze on God's immanence, 211
Luke's gospel, date of, 80
 Legends in, 75
 Date of early chapters of, 81

Man, concepts of, 231, 232, 233
Marcion at Rome, 80
Martineau, 12, 13
Marcus Aurelius, 28
Method, necessity of, 235
Meyer on Phil. 2. 6, 204
Messianic prophecies, 49, 50–62
 Difficulties of rationalists with, 63
Modern thought and heathen religions, 196
Mother of Jesus aware of his mysterious nature, 84, 85
Mythical theory of rationalists, 71, 72, 75
Mystery of creation, 185

Newman, J. H., letters on Buddhism, 97

Oscar Holtzman on birthplace of Jesus, 154
Ottley on Christ's personality, 162
Objections to Kenotic view noted, 226
Originality of Jesus, 189, 190

Parallels, Christ and heathen heroes, 89, 90–113
Paul on preëxistence of Christ, 141

Paul's doctrine of atonement and the virgin birth, 124
Paul's faith in Jesus, 46–48
Paul's knowledge of the virgin birth, 114
Paul, author of speculative belief of Christ, 14
Patrology, argument from, 136, 137
Pedigree, Christ must have human, 83
Personality of Jesus, 163–166
Pfleiderer on heathen parallels, 89
His notions of early Christian views of Christ, 91
Preëxistence of Christ, Beyschlag's view, 168

Renan, his *Vie de Jésus*, 23
His tribute to Jesus, 177
Ramsey quoted, 87
Rationalism, the Jesus of, 13, 22
He must do things, 44
Resemblance between narratives of Christ's birth and that of Augustus, 87
Réville, Professor J. A., on the gospels, 28, 29

Satiricon of Petronius, 115
Shakespeare, illustrations from, 138
Schmidt, Professor N., *Prophet of Nazareth*, 42
Silence, argument from, 114–116
Sinless Christ, 120–123, 147–149
Sin, heredity, arrested in virgin birth, 151
Similarity between gospel narratives and heathen legends, 94
Supernatural Religion, argument from, 130

Taxing under Cyrenius, 20, 76
Teachers, world's great, 188
Teachers' world, outgrown, 194
Teachings of Jesus, 197, 198, 199
Thomasian view of the Kenosis, 225

Unconscious race prophecies, 110
Union, ethical theory of, 154
Universal taint, 121
Unitarianism, 15, 16
Ur of the Chaldees, 110

Virgin birth and Hebrew sources, 69–72, 75, 82, 84
Confirmed by biblical criticism, 78
Paul's knowledge of, 78
Heathen parallels to, 89, 102, 104, 106, 12
Denial of, 122, 123, 142, 143

Words of Jesus, parallels to, 189, 190
Way God was made man, 226, 228

Zumpt on census, referred to, 20

1759 R

Date Due

Ag 12

MAY 4 '64

MAY 18 '64

DEC 18 1971

MAR 17 1995

Mount Union College Libraries
232.1 C773i MBO
Cooke, Richard J./The incarnation and re
[redacted]
3 7048 00088 7139

WITHDRAWN

232.1-C773i 17592
AUTHOR
Cooke, R.J.
TITLE The Incarnation and
Recent Criticism
DATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME
[illegible] [illegible]

232.1-C773i 17592

GAYLORD
S